DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 331 908 UD 027 968

AUTHOR	Mingle, James R., Ed.; Rodriguez, Esther M., Ed.
TITLE	Building Coalitions for Minority Success: A Report of the SHEEO Project on Minority Achievement in Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	State Higher Education Executive Officers Association.
SPONS AGENCY	Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Nov 90
NOTE	65p.
AVAILABLE FROM	State Higher Education Executive Officers, 707 17th Street, Suite 2700, Denver, CO 80202-3427 ($14.00).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; American Indians; Black Students; Case Studies; College Students; *Educational Cooperation; *Educational Opportunities; Equal Education; *Higher Education; *Minority Groups; Program Descriptions; *State Boards of Education
IDENTIFIERS	Coalitions; Collaboratives; *State Role

ABSTRACT

This report describes initiatives of higher education boards to provide equal educational opportunities for minority students in the following states: (1) Arizona; (2) Colorado; (3) Illinois; (4) Massachusetts; (5) Montana; (6) New York; (7) Ohio; and (8) Tennessee. Evidence of school completion, academic preparation, college participation rates, undergraduate enrollment, and college graduation rates supports the compelling observation that minorities, many of whom are in lower socioeconomic levels, are caught in a cycle of defeat and have not been well served by higher education or the education system in general. Experience indicates that the disparity among achievement levels of White, Black, Hispanic, and American Indian students will not be adequately addressed until there is systematic change at state and institutional levels. In 1988-89, the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) sponsored a challenge grant program that sought responses to the following issues: (1) improved data collection and student tracking mechanisms; (2) improved student transfer functions of two-year institutions; and (3) improved funding and admissions policies. This publication presents higher education board reports from the eight states selected to develop models of success. The reports reveal that minority success requires a concerted and coordinated effort from all the partners: public schools, colleges and universities, community agencies, businesses, and state and institutional leaders. (AF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED331908

Building Coalitions for Minority Success

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Catherine Walker
SHEEO

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SHEEO

STATE HIGHER EDUCATION EXECUTIVE OFFICERS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CE 057 968

Building Coalitions for Minority Success

A Report of the SHEEO Project on Minority Achievement in Higher Education

James R. Mingle
and
Esther M. Rodriguez, eds.

November 1990

State Higher Education Executive Officers
707-17th Street, Suite 2700
Denver, Colorado 80202-3427
303-299-3685

Copies of this book are available for $14.00 from the State Higher Education Executive Officers, 707 17th Street, Suite 2700, Denver, Colorado 80202-3427, 303-299-3686.

The State Higher Education Executive Officers is a nonprofit, nationwide association of the chief executive officers serving statewide coordinating boards and governing boards of postsecondary education. Forty-nine states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Canadian province of Quebec are members.

Contents

Executive Summary v

Acknowledgements ix

Introduction 1
Building the Coalition: A Challenge to State Leadership

State Profiles: Arizona 5
The Arizona Cooperative: A Strategy for Collaboration

State Profiles: Colorado 11
Tracking Students Through the System: A Plan To Improve Minority Achievement

State Profiles: Illinois 17
The Illinois Challenge: Improving Minority Achievement Through Transfer

State Profiles: Massachusetts 25
Increasing Student Transfer: A Solution to the Minority Teacher Shortage in Massachusetts

State Profiles: Montana 31
Montana "Tracks": A State's Commitment to American Indian Education

State Profiles: New York 37
Increasing the Number of Minority Teachers in New York: A Lesson in Joint Program Development

State Profiles: Ohio 43
Turning Communities Into Education Laboratories: The Ohio Project

State Profiles: Tennessee 49
Financial Incentives: Tennessee's Opportunity for Progress

Conclusion 55
Building Coalitions: Lessons Learned

Appendix 59
State Higher Education Boards Awarded Challenge Grants

Notes 61

Executive Summary

BUILDING COALITIONS FOR MINORITY SUCCESS

Providing equal opportunity for minorities has been one of the greatest challenges for higher education policy makers for over two decades. Although countless programs have been implemented, progress has been disappointing. A major reason is that the system hasn't focused on success and hasn't changed to meet the needs of the students it's recruiting.

Building Coalitions for Minority Success demonstrates how state higher education boards are providing leadership and changing their roles to create both opportunity and success for minorities. These boards are creating a new agenda by bringing together all those who have a stake and a role in minority education — the schools, the community and the various sectors in higher education.

The initiatives of the following eight higher education boards provide case studies of this new agenda building process — the process of building coalitions for minority success.

Arizona: The Arizona Minority Education Access and Achievement Cooperative was established to respond to the educational needs of the state's growing minority population. It is a voluntary association composed of officials from the State Board of Regents, State Board of Education and State Community College Board. The cooperative will improve minority achievement through joint planning, comprehensive program development, widely-shared expertise and constant communication.

Over the past year, the cooperative accomplished four major objectives. First, pilot projects involving cooperative planning and program implementation among the three education system's were funded. Second, the three systems jointly worked to communicate with the state and its various constituencies about the importance of improving minority achievement. Third, statewide conferences were sponsored to promote networking among the three education systems and external organizations. Finally, a compact was written that includes a set of policy endorsements and commitments made by the three governing boards.

Colorado: Colorado's growing minority student population combined with their disproportionately low college graduation rates prompted the Colorado Commission on Higher Education to develop a computerized tracking system. The system monitors the progress of minority students through college and enhances existing college-level programs targeted at degree completion.

Development of the tracking system was the first phase in a three-phase project to review the status of minorities in higher education and revamp policies that hinder their success. Meeting the goals of the project has involved high levels of collaboration between the state's higher education systems, colleges and universities and minority advocacy groups.

One of the most important project outcomes has been increased awareness and knowledge about the difficulties faced by minority students. This will help policy makers make informed decisions that more effectively impact the educational success of the minority student population.

Illinois: Increasing minority student achievement has been high on the agenda of the Illinois Board of Higher Education. Most recently, attention has focused on increasing the number of minority students who transfer from associate to baccalaureate degree-granting institutions.

The board examined and revised its transfer and articulation policies to support the goal that campuses and faculties work together to improve the transfer function and thereby increase the number of minority students who receive

bachelor's degrees. The board also developed a system that identifies outstanding programs for increasing minority student recruitment and retention to more effectively allocate state funds.

Cooperatively working with public and non-public institutions earned the state's project a high degree of statewide commitment and visibility. Another favorable outcome includes a new Minority Articulation Program that supports inter-institutional efforts to improve the transfer and degree completion of minority students.

Massachusetts: Recognizing the urgent need for more minority teachers, the Massachusetts Board of Regents established the Collaborative Teacher Education Program. It is an effort that allows minority students to begin their college education at a two-year institution with guarantees of continued study toward degree completion at a four-year institution's teacher preparation program.

Two pilot projects were funded through the program. Each involved collaboration between one or more community colleges and a four-year institution with a teacher certification program. Students recruited into the program will graduate from a two-year college and transfer to the four-year college to complete their degree in education and receive teacher certification.

Successes of the Collaborative Teacher Education Program include an improvement in the communication and joint planning between two- and four-year schools and improvement in the services offered to minority community college students to help them smoothly transfer to a four-year college.

Montana: American Indians are the only significant minority group in Montana, but they historically have been under-represented in the state's colleges and universities. The Montana "Tracks" Project was designed and implemented to increase Indian participation in higher education by creating bridges across the education sectors.

The Montana University System developed "Tracks" — a database and tracking system to monitor American Indian education participation and achievement from kindergarten through college. Other project outcomes include state goals, activities and time lines to increase participation and achievement, plus strategies for getting more legislative financial support for the effort.

Significant time and hard work was spent to tear down American Indian citizens' mistrust of the system and gain their respect and commitment to the project's goals. As a result, there is a coordinated partnership between the state and tribes to track, monitor and improve the education of American Indians.

New York: New York has had a long-standing commitment to meet the education needs of its large minority population. This has meant offering minorities equal access to an education, and most recently, ensuring that they are represented in the teaching profession.

To further its efforts, the New York State Education Department developed the Jointly Registered Teacher Education Programs to Improve Minority Baccalaureate Achievement. The initiative encourages and assists two- and four-year colleges and universities to develop joint teacher education programs allowing minority students to begin work toward their degrees at a two-year institution and complete the program at a four-year institution.

Rather than require one model, the department has encouraged institutions to develop a variety of strategies. The resulting programs each have unique characteristics suited to the institutions' student populations, faculties, communities and available resources.

Ohio: A 1988 study by the Ohio Board of Regents revealed that the state was not doing a satisfactory job of recruiting minority students into its colleges and universities. To help remedy the problem, the board established the Urban Postsecondary Education Demonstration Program.

Colleges and universities, public schools, social agencies, foundations and other community groups work together toward collaborative, comprehensive strategies. Consequently, the process creates community awareness of and involvement in approaches to increase the number of minority students graduating from high

school and continuing on to two- and four-year institutions.

During the planning phase, several statewide activities facilitated work at the local level. They included providing leadership, convening planning meetings, finding necessary resources for local group collaboration, providing program evaluation and analysis, developing formidable policies and removing state-level barriers to change.

Tennessee: The state of Tennessee has been considered an innovator in financing higher education through performance-driven incentive funding. Performance funding allows colleges and universities to receive public monies above the amount they receive through the typical formula funding. Because performance funding has proved so successful in improving higher education in general, the Tennessee Higher Education Commission developed a similar program aimed at improving minority student achievement in higher education.

The effort will allow colleges and universities to receive financial incentives for improving racial equity on their campuses and increasing the retention and graduation success of minority students. The process to implement the new performance funding program involved the collaboration of several groups including the commission, both of the state's higher education governing boards, the legislature and community representatives.

Acknowledgements

For the past four years, the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) has made minority postsecondary achievement one of its highest priorities. What began as a modest effort to address the changing needs of our constituents — the state higher education boards and the higher education communities that they represent — has evolved into a national initiative. We would like to sincerely thank several individuals whose leadership and commitment directly influenced and helped to shape this effort.

In 1986, SHEEO President Richard Wagner of the Illinois Board of Higher Education appointed the Task Force on Minority Achievement in Higher Education, chaired by T. Edward Hollander, chancellor of the New Jersey Department of Higher Education. The task force was charged with recommending ways that state higher education boards could improve the collegiate achievement of minority students. Its work reflected in the 1987 report, *A Difference of Degrees: State Initiatives to Improve Minority Student Achievement*, authored by Diane Yavorsky of the New Jersey Department of Higher Education, became the catalyst for significant commitment by the state boards on this issue.

Soon afterward, Alison Bernstein, program officer with the Ford Foundation, contacted SHEEO Executive Director James Mingle about developing a strategy to encourage the state boards to adopt the recommendations in the task force report. The result was the SHEEO Challenge Grant Project on Minority Achievement in Higher Education funded by the Ford Foundation. We are extremely grateful for Alison's counsel and for the support of Peter Stanley and others at the Ford Foundation.

We are also grateful to the committee that read and selected proposals for grant awards. Juliet Garcia, Blenda Wilson, Ted Hollander, Richard C. Richardson, Jr., Thomas Cole and Patrick Callan provided thoughtful attention to project activities and the long-term consequences of these grants.

The project directors and coordinators from the eight state boards that received SHEEO grants deserve particular praise for their hard work and dedication. We appreciate the accomplishments of Edward Johnson in Arizona, Martha Romero, Mark Chisholm and Sharon Samson in Colorado, Ann Bragg in Illinois, George Lowery and Marion Darlington-Hope in Massachusetts, Rene Dubay and Deborah LaCounte in Montana, Mike Van Ryn, Denis Paul and Ann Marie Haase in New York, Ann Moore and Judith James in Ohio and Lucius Ellsworth, Wynetta Lee and Mattielyn Williams in Tennessee.

Throughout the project, Michael T. Nettles, vice president for assessment at the University of Tennessee, has provided invaluable service as our external evaluator, advisor and colleague.

We also appreciate the special assistance of our friend and colleague, Charles Lenth, who read and critiqued numerous drafts of this publication and who has provided valuable feedback and guidance throughout the course of this project.

Thanks also to Kim Moyer for her excellent editing skills, Sherry Walker, Anna West and Elizabeth Holman for their preparation of this publication, and to Cathy Walker and Adrienne Sack for their great assistance in planning the activities and preparing the publications that made up this project.

Finally, we would like to thank the members of SHEEO for their unanimous support and commitment to this effort.

James R. Mingle
Esther M. Rodriguez

November 1990

Introduction

BUILDING THE COALITION: A CHALLENGE TO STATE LEADERSHIP

Achieving equal education opportunity for blacks, Hispanics and American Indians is not a new issue. In fact, it has been one of the major forces shaping higher education for the past 25 years. The federal government, states, colleges and universities have undertaken an extraordinary number of efforts to open the doors of postsecondary education. But while *access* as measured by counting the number of students admitted to an institution may once have appeared an appropriate goal, today it is considered only a stepping stone to the higher education experience. Equal education opportunity also means providing the range of support that ensures minority student success as reflected in academic performance, completion at both the undergraduate and graduate degree levels and professional career attainment.

Countless reports and articles have argued that it is imperative to enhance minority student success in higher education, yet problems persist. Citing social equity, demographic changes in many states and global economic competition, several recent reports urge federal, state and institution policy makers to reevaluate longstanding efforts and think about new ways to move minorities more effectively into the mainstream of postsecondary educational opportunity. Additionally, there are new and more disturbing tensions that will persuade policy makers to act. The growing problem of racial conflict both on and off campus requires a need for fresh thinking about campus climate, curriculum and the broader question of inclusion of minorities in the professional life of the nation.

In the last decade, we have been caught in the position of seeing both improvements and setbacks simultaneously. We have evidence that shows the initiatives of the '60s and '70s worked and that generational progress has been made. For example, minority students in middle- and upper-income levels are attending college at rates similar to those of white students.[1] Unfortunately, the vast majority of black, Hispanic and American Indian students come from lower income levels where recent studies show the odds increasing against educational advancement for such students.[2] The compelling observation is that minorities, many of whom are in lower socioeconomic levels, are caught in a cycle of defeat and have not been well served by higher education or the education system in general. Evidence for this can be traced at every point in the educational process.

School completion

Minorities continue to trail the national average in high school completion rates. In 1989, 12.4% of 16 to 24-year-old whites had not completed high school, compared to 13.8% of blacks and 33% of Hispanics.[3] Factors that indicate students are at risk of dropping out of school, including family income of less than $15,000 and parents with no high school diploma, are significantly more prevalent among black, Hispanic and American Indian students than among white students. For example, only 14% of white eighth-grade students are from families with incomes of $15,000 or less, compared to 37.5% of Hispanic, 47% of black and 40% of American Indian eighth graders. Among this same group of students, over 33% of Hispanics, 16% of blacks and 13% of American Indians had parents who had not graduated from high school, compared to 6% of whites.[4]

Academic preparation

High proportions of minority students who do stay in school and graduate are not academically prepared to succeed at the postsecondary level due to low participation rates in math, science and college preparatory courses. Compared to 47% of Asian students and 34% of white students who are taking advanced math

and science in eighth grade, only 24% of Hispanics, 26% of blacks and 26% of American Indians are in such courses. Only 20% of students from families earning $15,000 or less are taking this curriculum, compared to 47% of students from families with incomes over $50,000.[8] In a report based on the 1980 *High School and Beyond* survey conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), students most likely to major and graduate in science and engineering in college have taken advanced math and science courses in high school and are able to indicate their intentions to major in these subjects in college.[9] Additionally, data from the NCES Public School Survey show that schools with the highest proportion of minorities (75% or greater) are least likely to have advanced-placement programs (5% as opposed to 47% for schools with minority enrollment of less than 5%). Thus it is more difficult and unlikely for minority students to build upon their skills or aspirations in advanced placement subjects.[8]

College participation rates

About one of every three 18-to-24-year-olds was enrolled in college in fall 1988. This participation rate has increased steadily from two decades ago when only one of every four college-aged youth was enrolled.

Black participation, however, shows a different pattern. It rose significantly in the late '60s and early '70s and then leveled off. Today, only one of every five black youths is enrolled, a rate that has actually declined from its high point in 1976. Although Hispanics have increased their total numbers in higher education, their college-going rates continue to lag behind both blacks and whites. In 1988, only 17% of Hispanic youths were enrolled in college.[8]

Undergraduate enrollment

The racial/ethnic makeup of higher education has not significantly changed during the past 10 years. Black enrollment as a percentage of total enrollment has declined from 9.4% to 8.7%, while Hispanic enrollment rose from 3.7% to 5.2%. (Total enrollment of black males actually declined despite a growth in overall enrollment of more than 1.8 million students.[8]) While Hispanic enrollment grew significantly, its 5.2% representation in the college ranks is notably less than its 8.2% representation in the general population.[10]

Minority students are much more likely than white students to enroll in community and technical colleges and are less likely than white students to transfer to a baccalaureate degree-granting institution. For example, 36% of white students enrolled in postsecondary institutions attend community colleges, while 56% of Hispanics, 42% of blacks and 54% of American Indians are enrolled in these institutions.[11] Furthermore, over 60% of minorities in community colleges are in part-time or nonacademic programs.[12] Little data exist on the rate of transfer for minority students, but some reports indicate that transfer rates to baccalaureate institutions for all students are low and range from 5% to 25%.[13]

Graduation rates

Many minority students enrolled in higher education institutions are not persisting to graduation. Blacks, Hispanics and American Indians continue to be severely under-represented with respect to baccalaureate degree attainment rates. Between 1976 and 1987 (the most current data available on graduation rates), the number of bachelor's degrees awarded to minorities collectively did not change: it remains at 8.8% of degrees conferred.[14] Since black, Hispanic and American Indian undergraduate enrollment together expanded to approximately 15% of total enrollment, degree achievement will have to increase significantly just to keep pace.

A challenge to state higher education boards

The reasons for the failure to retain and graduate larger numbers of minorities are many and complex. One key factor is the lack of sustained political and moral leadership being brought to bear on this important issue, which in turn shapes the fragmented and disjointed way in which the problem is approached.

In the public schools, limited early outreach, inappropriate curriculum, high dropout rates, lack of information about the opportunities

available (for students as well as parents), and low expectations from those helping students make decisions about their education (i.e., teachers and counselors) all directly affect the lack of success by students at the postsecondary level.

In higher education, inadequate counseling and support services, complicated or inconsistent information about financial aid, inhospitable campus environments, faculty who are not invested in the success of their students and sensitive to their needs and concerns, and barriers in moving students from lower division to upper division, from community college to four-year institutions and from four-year institutions to graduate programs, continue to impede successful student participation and achievement in higher education.

It is clear from past experience that the disparity between achievement levels of white, black, Hispanic and American Indian students will not be adequately addressed until there is systematic change at state and institutional levels. To reinforce this, the 1987 report of the Task Force on Minority Achievement in Higher Education, convened by the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO), strongly urged state higher education boards to establish minority student achievement as a preeminent concern for the higher education community within their states. In the task force report, *A Difference of Degrees: State Initiatives to Improve Minority Student Achievement*, state boards were encouraged to:

- Develop formal institutional planning and reporting processes dedicated to improving minority access and achievement
- Actively pursue more aggressive involvement with elementary and secondary education
- Ensure that opportunities for earning baccalaureate degrees are available to minority students at associate and baccalaureate degree-granting institutions alike
- Institute broad-based programs to promote racial and ethnic diversity among higher education's professional ranks
- Regularly disseminate information, both to the public and the higher education community, about higher education opportunities for minority students and how their needs can be met[3]

The report advised state boards to go beyond their normal statutory responsibilities and missions to define and assume new roles. In addition to defining these new roles, state boards now are being challenged to use their leadership positions to leverage new relationships with institutions and the community and to develop new management tools that will improve and enhance institution and student performance outcomes.

These challenges are formidable because the SHEEO task force suggested roles that state boards had not previously assumed. Convening various education sectors and the community requires boards to demonstrate a broad vision of how each group can contribute to resolving a common problem. Building bridges between and among sectors means mediating long-standing conflicts to help the groups develop joint solutions to problems. Developing coalitions means gaining consensus on the nature of the problems of minority achievement and the desired goals.

To reinforce the recommendations of the task force report, in 1988-89 SHEEO sponsored a challenge grant program funded by the Ford Foundation. Specifically, SHEEO sought responses to three issues:

- Improved data collection and student tracking mechanisms
- Improved student transfer functions of two-year institutions
- Improved funding and admissions policies

The challenge grants were used to solicit ideas and develop strategies to help states move beyond access as a measure of success and deal directly with those issues, both academic and non-academic, that most impede persistence and degree achievement. Additionally, states were to solicit the assistance, support and collaboration of the leadership of higher education institutions, other state agencies, schools and community

organizations. Thirty-four state boards responded to the challenge and eight states were selected to develop models of success.

State leadership key to building coalitions

The following state board reports show that the challenge has produced impressive responses. The SHEEO grants enabled the selected states to develop innovative and ambitious new plans and procedures for achieving long-term commitment to improve minority student achievement. In Arizona and Ohio, communities work with state agencies and institutions to address the education needs of minority students. In Illinois, New York and Massachusetts, the goal is to bring the associate and baccalaureate degree-granting institutions and their faculties together to find joint solutions to increase minority degree attainment. In Montana, Colorado and Tennessee, education agencies and institutions team resources to track students and develop incentives that will move students successfully to degree completion.

The unifying theme found in each of the eight projects is a high level of collaboration. The reports reveal that minority success requires a concerted and coordinated effort from all the partners — public schools, colleges and universities, community agencies, businesses and state and institutional leaders.

While the eight models are still in various stages of implementation, they offer valuable lessons that can be shared with other states. One of the most important of these is how to build capacity for developing policy on this issue. These efforts represent new steps towards realizing education opportunity for minorities for today and tomorrow. We hope that they will be models for all state higher education boards, catalysts for changing institutions, and means for ensuring continued progress in achieving true minority student success.

Esther M. Rodriguez
Director of Special Projects

State Profiles: Arizona

THE ARIZONA COOPERATIVE: A STRATEGY FOR COLLABORATION

The significant improvement of minority student achievement at all education levels has evolved into one of Arizona's highest education priorities. It is a moral and economic imperative. Arizona's changing demographics, like many other states, compel action.

- More than 25% of the state's population is ethnic minority.
- Nearly 40% of the children enrolled in kindergarten through third grade are ethnic minority.
- More than 60 languages are spoken in the homes of public school students.
- More than 12% of the state's community college and university students are ethnic minorities.

Each of Arizona's three education governing boards, the Arizona Board of Regents, State Board of Education and State Community College Board, have taken action in numerous minority student initiatives. Efforts have focused on education opportunity programs, outcomes and eligibility assessments, institutional challenges to improve instruction and services and institutional progress reports. These individual efforts have been somewhat helpful in removing access barriers. (For example, the state has increased university admission rates of Hispanic, African American and American Indian students by an average of 10% per year since 1980. But unfortunately, the number of minorities graduating with bachelor's degrees over the same period of time has not increased. Community colleges and public schools have also had disappointing results.)

These sobering facts have caused Arizona and its education governing boards to finally acknowledge that if minority student achievement is to be improved, they must move beyond mandates and individual initiatives. The complexity of the challenge calls for a new way of doing business. Key entities — colleges and universities, community colleges, public schools, executive and legislative branches, tribal governments, business and industry, private and voluntary organizations and the federal government — must form and expand working coalitions. Only through collaboration can systemic change take place to significantly improve minority student achievement.

Involvement is key

In Arizona, there is ample evidence that partnership programs are successful when children are reached in the early grades through a comprehensive set of interventions. But the state has lacked the structures to assure their replication.

These conclusions were reached through a complex, three-stage public examination of minority student achievement challenges. It primarily focused on achievement in terms of earning a bachelor's degree.

The first stage included a recommendation by a statewide citizens task force that the Board of Regents adopt aggressive admissions and graduation goals. The board did just that.[10] In response, the legislature has appropriated additional funding for expanded early outreach, admissions and retention programs.

During the second stage, members of the legislature, universities, public schools, community colleges and community-based organizations formed an Ad Hoc Committee on University Access and Retention to critique university outreach, admissions and retention policies and programs and approve university plans to expend additional funds for minority programs. Its final report identified a comprehensive set of recommendations for action by all three education systems. But more importantly, by sitting down

together and listening, members learned more about each other, each other's priorities and realities and the opportunities for success that exist through cooperative efforts. The foundation for personal relationships required to create long-term, statewide, institutional change had been laid.

The third stage of the process was the most challenging: how could Arizona take advantage of the momentum created by the ad hoc committee's work to help ensure its recommended changes would be institutionalized across the three education systems? The SHEEO grant, funded by the Ford Foundation, became the window of opportunity.

Plan of action

With grant support, the Arizona Minority Education Access and Achievement Cooperative was formed. It is a voluntary association composed of chief executive officers and others from the Board of Regents, State Board of Education and State Community College Board. Members also include university and community college presidents, school superintendents and citizens. The major mission of the cooperative is to improve minority student access, and, most important, achievement, through cooperative planning, comprehensive program development, widely shared expertise and constant communication.

During its first year of operation, the cooperative undertook several major projects: distribution of pilot project grants, initiation of a State Compact for Citizens' Education, sponsorship of two state workshops and development of a State Achievement Compact.

First, the cooperative sent out a request for proposals, seeking to distribute seed money for cooperative planning and implementation projects among the three education systems. Seventy-one proposals were received and seven projects were funded. (This massive response to a new program solidified the cooperative's view that opportunities for nurturing partnerships are immense.)

Second, the cooperative initiated the drafting of a State Compact for Citizens' Education. The compact will outline commitments from the three systems to jointly work to communicate with the state and its various constituencies about the importance of improving minority student achievement and the risk to the state if improvement is not made. The cooperative also will develop and distribute information about the importance of staying in school, admissions criteria and financial aid opportunities.

Third, the cooperative sponsored two state workshops on minority achievement issues. The first encouraged education policy makers and institutional researchers to establish informal networks to share information and ideas. The second facilitated the formation and strengthening of networks among the three education systems and external organizations.

To take advantage of workshop attenders' new-found knowledge and energy, the cooperative plans to award seed grants to teams from the three systems that agree to hold follow-up planning meetings and form working partnerships. Teams will be required to submit a report to the cooperative on their efforts.

Finally, and most important, the cooperative approved the Arizona Compact for Minority Student Achievement, a historic agreement believed to be the first of its kind in the United States. The compact outlines the joint commitment of the three governing boards to provide the necessary leadership and structure for reaching statewide minority education achievement targets.

A firm foundation

The compact begins with a set of policy endorsements that reflect the undergirding of the cooperative and set the tone for the document:

1. Each of the three systems must extend its historical focus on student access to include an intense focus on student achievement.
2. The ultimate goal of collective and individual efforts is proportional enrollments and comparable achievement across disciplines.
3. Collectively developed minority student achievement strategies must focus on achievement throughout the entire education enterprise, from preschool through graduate school.

Partnerships for Success: Arizona Minority Education Access and Achievement Cooperative

The cooperative provided planning grants for collaborative programs that will extend the educational pipeline for minority students. Some innovative programs include:

- **Project YES (Youth Experiencing Success)** brings seventh- and eighth-grade students to a university campus to attend a series of talks and workshop experiences designed to promote long-range educational awareness and planning, motivation to stay in school, appreciation of ethnic heritage and enhancement of self-esteem, contact and familiarization with an institution of higher education.

- **Pathway to Opportunity** assists minority high school students to participate in higher education. The program helps students to assess their goals and opportunities, tracks and guides potential college and university students to academic programs and offers students a university-conducted course on critical thinking.

- **The Partnership in Life Sciences Education** brings Indian community college students to the University of Arizona for a summer experience in biology laboratories. The program introduces students to biological research and supports them through counseling and advising services that provide them information and build their confidence to transfer to a four-year institution to complete their bachelor's degrees.

- **The Visiting Scholars Partnership Program** provides the opportunity for minority Ph.D. candidates to lead classroom and field-based experiences with community college students. Doctoral candidates act as mentors to students and are mentored by senior community college faculty. The program is designed to create an integral support system between community college faculty, graduate instructors serving as associate faculty and community college students.

- **Project 2001 Elementary School Program** introduces elementary school children and their parents from migrant farm communities to higher education environments by conducting tours of community college and university campuses, conducting workshops to build students' aspirations for higher education, educating students and parents on college enrollment procedures, scholarships and other financial aid and encouraging elementary school faculty and staff to incorporate lessons on higher education into their curriculum.

- **The Summer Writing Program** sponsored by the University of Arizona and Tuba City High School is an intensive, cross-cultural, interdisciplinary program for high school students. It enhances students' reading, speaking and writing abilities, provides an on-going yearly forum that builds upon skills learned in preceding sessions, acquaints students with the rigors of college academic life and encourages students to enroll and successfully complete a college degree at the University of Arizona.

4. Achievement strategies must recognize the inherent strengths and advantages of partnerships while maintaining respect for system and institutional autonomy.

5. Partnership strategies must address the specific needs of the populations served.

The leadership of the three boards is expressed through five strategic commitments:

1. *Goal setting.* Local boards will be urged to establish minority student access and achievement goals, including, where applicable, the adoption of long-term goals of proportional representation and comparable achievement. Individual educational institutions will be urged, when applicable, to establish administrative goals of proportional representation and graduation with comparable achievement for their minority student populations.

2. *Evaluation of success.* Local boards will be urged to formally evaluate their individual success in reaching achievement-oriented goals and to report this data to appropriate constituents. All educational institutions will be urged to carefully measure their success and formally report these efforts to appropriate boards. Finally, statewide success in improving minority student achievement will be reviewed periodically.

3. *Statewide commitment and action.* Each board will adopt a policy of active inter-systems cooperation regarding minority student achievement through the encouragement of involvement by key constituents at all levels. Collaboration among local boards, students, parents, faculty, administrators, student services personnel, business, industry, government, private and voluntary organizations, tribal governments and social agencies will be promoted.

4. *Inter-board partnerships.* Key policy issues that create inter-system barriers to improved minority student achievement will collectively and systematically be addressed. Key issues may include, but are not limited to, admissions criteria, financial aid, assessment, teacher preparation, academic transition to each system and curriculum-related policies, as well as identification of partnership resources.

5. *Program partnerships.* Local boards and all education institutions will be urged to form significantly more program partnerships. Replication of successful programs will be urged as well as the creation of new, innovative models that build upon cultural and academic strengths. The three boards will take a leadership role in supporting these efforts through policies that support, recognize and reward collaboration among educational institutions and systems. The boards also will take a leadership role in identifying the resources required to fulfill this commitment.

The compact is the initial road map to guide Arizona's education systems on their common path towards improved minority student achievement, and, ultimately, improved achievement for all students. It will immediately stimulate significant debate, planning and action. The cooperative intends to drive those processes at local levels. Other activities generated from the compact, including information clearinghouses, joint training sessions and development of academic networks across the three systems, are envisioned.

Involvement by institutions from all three sectors has been significant. Much time has been spent communicating with the institutions about the mission and goals of the cooperative, and institutional representatives have been very diligent about distributing information.

Successful outcomes

The cooperative accomplished a great deal during its first year of operation. Many positive outcomes are credited to it. The Board of Regents' admission and graduation goals are a key element in the strategy and have helped convince universities that they must reach out and work with the other two education systems to meet the goals. In response, universities have established literally dozens of new retention programs.

The role of the three state education governing boards will change as a result of the cooperative. The Compact for Minority Student Achievement gives them a leadership role that they previously did not have and will encourage them to be much more proactive. The compact also commits the boards to a much stronger review of outcomes and evaluation of institutional efforts. Additionally, the compact commits the boards to form partnerships to develop or change policies impacting minority student achievement. This strategic commitment will play a key role in developing statewide policies required for improving achievement.

The notion that the senior officials of the education governing boards would form this new, voluntary association has sent a message to other entities in the state that there are serious intentions to collectively improve minority achievement. The peer leadership phenomenon has caused both the Board of Regents and the cooperative's Operating Committee to work hard and in good faith to meet goals.

The most important unintended outcome has been the development of strong personal relationships and high levels of trust among the cooperative members. These types of relationships, as developed over time through the cooperative, will be the foundation of real breakthroughs in joint planning and collaborative initiatives.

Positive reactions

Reactions to the cooperative's work generally have been favorable. The governor and legislature are aware of the cooperative and are supportive of its efforts. The appropriation for additional access and achievement programs demonstrates the legislature's support for the cooperative's efforts. The broader community also has been supportive. External organizations view the cooperative as a new vehicle to encourage the education systems to work with them.

However, as with any new organization, it is taking time to communicate and demonstrate the value of the cooperative's efforts. Any expressed uncertainties relate to the precise role of the cooperative *vis-a-vis* other initiatives.

It is not yet clear what the precise role of the cooperative will be in the overall state strategy, but the State Achievement Compact will provide the cooperative with a vehicle to focus its efforts. The document clearly states that the cooperative intends to take a lead role in encouraging local institutions to improve access and achievement. As the cooperative focuses on its goals and as its members strengthen relationships, the precise role will evolve over time. The biggest challenge will be to carefully craft an ongoing role for the cooperative that does not intrude, circumvent or otherwise threaten individual initiatives in each system. The cooperative intends to periodically survey itself and external constituencies to evaluate its impact and successes.

What's next?

Next steps in the cooperative's evolution are:

- Development of a formal mission statement
- Development of new goals and objectives
- Development of a stable funding source
- Development and execution of a plan to encourage adoption of the State Achievement Compact by local boards and institutions
- Approval of the State Compact for Citizens' Education
- A stronger communications program to inform the state about the cooperative and its programs

While this particular cooperative model may not work in every state, its key elements can be replicated, through any number of structures, anywhere. Those elements include voluntary, equivalent representation from all education sectors and citizens, comprehensive planning, ownership in the outcomes, high degrees of commitment for statewide success, senior-level representation, mutual respect, an ultimate focus at the local level, and realistic, self-imposed deadlines for completion of assignments.

Edward Johnson
Arizona Board of Regents

State Profiles: Colorado

TRACKING STUDENTS THROUGH THE SYSTEM: A PLAN TO IMPROVE MINORITY ACHIEVEMENT

Colorado's growing numbers of minority students combined with disproportionately low college graduation rates present a problem that needs immediate attention.

- Minorities make up 17% of the state's population.
- By the year 2000, one-fifth of the state's population will be minority, and one-fourth under 25 years of age will be minority.
- Minority students make up only 8.4% of current higher education enrollments.
- Only 5.9% of baccalaureate degrees and 12.6% of associate degrees are awarded to minority students.

To help address this imbalance, in 1985 the Colorado legislature passed HB 1187, which directed the Colorado Commission on Higher Education to develop several major policy initiatives for the state's public higher education system. As part of this package, the commission adopted a set of statewide affirmative action initiatives. These initiatives fall into five categories:

1. Assuring that minority students come to college better prepared
2. Reducing financial barriers to college attendance for minority students
3. Providing incentives to institutions of higher education to do a better job in serving the needs of minority students
4. Supporting those institutions that already are doing a good job
5. Changing the higher education environment so it is more receptive/less hostile to minority students

To ensure that minority students come to college better prepared, the commission is encouraging the state's colleges and universities to enhance and improve precollegiate programs that exist on many campuses. Institutions are discussing ways to coordinate their activities to avoid duplicating efforts in some high schools while neglecting others.

To reduce financial barriers to college attendance for minority students, the commission established and implemented the Colorado Diversity Grant program which provides grants to under-represented students. A large share of the resource goes to minority students. Additionally, 21% of the state's need-based grants are awarded to minority students.

To provide incentives to institutions to better serve minority students, the Programs of Excellence program was established. It provides grants to institutions for special programs that especially emphasize minority participation.

To support institutions that already serve minority students well, the state provides financial incentives through re-examining the process that determines how state appropriations are allocated.

To make the higher education environment more receptive to minority students, an administrator/faculty development fund is being developed. The fund will help institutions attract, retain and promote minority faculty and administrators.

The commission is also involved in an effort to establish the Colorado Minority Education Coalition, a public/private collaborative to increase the educational participation and success of Colorado's minority students through information sharing, policy analysis, program development support and advocacy.

All of these initiatives require accurate collection and comprehensive analysis of student data. The commission used the SHEEO grant to

develop a student tracking system, analyze the data generated by the system, and visit five college and university campuses to discuss ways to improve the performance of minority students.

These activities constitute phase one of a three-phase process to significantly improve baccalaureate achievement rates of minority students. The last two phases include the identification of financial incentives for improving minority participation, evaluation of current state policy and possible formulation of new legislation.

Specific outcomes of the total process are:

1. Development of a student tracking system that will improve Colorado's information base about institutional and systemwide efforts to increase minority student achievement
2. Identification of common factors across institutions that promote minority student success
3. Development of financial incentives that directly support the replication of common success factors in programs, subject areas and institutions
4. Evaluation and modification of state-level policies to support increased minority student achievement
5. Formulation of new legislation requiring institutions to better serve minority students
6. Development of a better transfer system allowing minority students more access to and success in higher education

Collaborative involvement

In its work on all three phases of this project, the commission used consultants and the advice of outside groups. The Data Advisory Group, made up of institutional research staff, reviewed the structure of the tracking system, analysis plan and draft reports on the progress of minority students at two-year and four-year institutions. The Academic Council, consisting of the chief academic officers of Colorado's six governing boards, was consulted about financial incentives. The institutional registrars, academic advisors and administrators who make up the Transfer Advisory Council reviewed the process for consistency. Two advocacy groups, the "Black Roundtable" and the higher education committee of the "Hispanic Agenda," received copies of the data analysis and were included in discussions of project activities. The agency also turned outside for members of the campus-visitation teams.

Before it could modify or develop new policies to promote minority achievement, the commission had to gain an understanding of the actual participation and achievement of minority students.

A database called the Cohort Tracking System was developed to track minority students along every point of the higher education pipeline. The system uses data collected from all of the state's public postsecondary institutions, including detailed information on high school academic preparation of all four-year applicants, inter-institutional transfers, specific programs, financial need and financial aid awards of applicants and recipients, and demographic descriptors such as race/ethnicity. The primary application of the collected information is to measure the effect different factors have on the achievement of minority students (i.e., how Colorado postsecondary institutions respond to changing minority high school graduation rates and how institutional and statewide policy impacts minority retention).

Traditional tracking systems track a group of students for a specified number of years starting from their enrollment in a specific institution. The Colorado system differs because it tracks students from any point of educational activity. (It is both entry- and exit-point oriented.) This difference is important since student entry and exit points can be significant factors in measuring the success or failure of a policy.

The commission has analyzed data generated from the system and developed measures that reflect the level of minority retention in the state's public postsecondary institutions. Using this analysis, a research team visited institutions to learn of the qualitative factors that help or hinder minority student success.

Three criteria were used to select campuses for site visits: location, mission and minority

retention statistics. Eventually, interviews were conducted at five institutions. One-on-one discussions were held with each institution's president, chief academic officer, chief student affairs officer, other administrators, directors of special programs for minority students, faculty and students.

What's been learned

The purpose of this project was to lay the groundwork for change — to gather the information needed to create workable incentives to improve the participation of minority students. This has been accomplished, although some changes in plans were made along the way.

Each component of the project was assessed in terms of its success, products, changes that took place as work proceeded and outcomes. Larger consequences also were considered — the reactions of institutions and the broader community, implications for the governor and legislature, next steps for the commission and the likelihood that the project will increase minority achievement.

The tracking system

Within the first year, Colorado completed the following system design activities: initial study of user needs, analysis of the current information system, exploration of alternative solutions, design of a new tracking system, and implementation and evaluation of the system. The evaluation of the tracking system indicated that Colorado had an effective decision-making support system for linking various data resources. However, the commission made one long-term change as a result of the evaluation.

Data are now collected for spring and summer terms as well as fall because term-to-term activity is a better indicator of student retention patterns than fall-to-fall. Also, the set of selection criteria was expanded to provide greater flexibility when requesting analysis files. Furthermore, the agency modified its Data Collection and Privacy Policy to permit institutions access to the cohort data while still protecting confidential financial aid information.

The tracking system has had many tangible outcomes. For example, special reports and studies generated from the system include:

- Statewide and institutional accountability reports, including separate reports for minority groups
- Affirmative action success of institutions on which higher education funding will be based
- Admissions and attendance patterns
- Impact of transfer policy on enrollment
- High school performance summaries
- Relationships between attendance and financial aid

Several institutions and governing boards also have requested data for studies. They include: a comparative study to assess the employment status of students who complete a degree program against those who do not complete a program and a retention study to identify the group of students who leave an institution and do not enroll in any other Colorado institution.

In addition, information from the system was used to develop retention measures for the progress of all first-time freshman who enrolled in Colorado public institutions in 1986. Patterns of retention by minority groups and institutions also were identified.

Another outcome has been to make the commission, the Data Advisory Group and the Academic Council more familiar with minority student information. As analyses were reviewed, everyone gained a statewide perspective on high school graduation rates, college applicants, baccalaureate degree recipients and patterns of enrollment, attendance and transfer. This greater familiarity with minority student circumstances helps in making more informed decisions about institutional initiatives.

Retention model

To identify institutions where minority students had a better chance of succeeding, indices

were developed from basic retention measures. Four indices were developed for four-year institutions: (1) within-school retention rate expressed relative to the retention rate for all students of the same ethnicity; (2) within-school retention rate expressed relative to the retention rate for whites at the same school; (3) within-system retention rate expressed relative to the retention rate for all students of the same ethnicity; and (4) within-system retention rate expressed relative to the retention rate for whites at the same school. Indices (2) and (4) were judged to be particularly important since they help to control for the fact that some institutions are more selective and all entering students are expected to have higher retention rates.

Similar indices also were developed for community colleges: (1) success rate expressed relative to the success rate for all students of the same ethnicity; (2) success rate expressed relative to the success rate of whites at the same school[1]; (3) percent of students transferring to a four-year school expressed relative to the transfer rate of all students of same ethnicity group; and (4) percent of students transferring to a four-year school expressed relative to the transfer rate of whites at the same school. As with the four-year analysis, indices (2) and (4) were judged to be the most important. These indices were combined to rate institutions. As a result, three four-year and two community colleges were selected for visits. Sites were distributed across governing boards, urban and rural locations and systems levels.

Campus visits

Team members compiled and analyzed the results of their individual interviews of program directors, faculty, administrators and students for each institution. Administrators were surveyed concerning such items as minority retention strategies, barriers, faculty involvement and financial support to minority programs. Faculty and students were asked questions about academic integration, social integration, educational goals and attitudes.

Responses from administrators, faculty, program directors and students clearly reflected their own perspectives. Administrators felt that the most effective strategies for minority retention are financial aid scholarship funds and pre-collegiate programs. Faculty believed advising and counseling made the greatest difference in retention of minorities and learning/cultural centers the second most successful approach. Students, on the other hand, felt strongly that learning/cultural centers had the greatest impact on retention and the availability of financial aid was the second contributing factor. Four conclusions were drawn from analyzing the interviews:

1. Ethnic-specific student service centers (cultural centers) are extremely important to minority student success in higher education. Existing centers provide such services as counseling, tutoring, peer and faculty mentoring, orientation, grade monitoring and social activities.
2. There is a lack of faculty and administrator awareness and sensitivity to minority attitudes and issues.
3. Generally, institutional faculty and administrators recognize problems of minority students' retention and graduation rates, but don't view solutions as their responsibility.
4. Financial constraints such as rising tuition costs and lack of scholarships are frequently cited as barriers prohibiting academic success.

The commission will use these conclusions to shape development of financial incentives and other policies.

Reactions by colleges and universities

Colorado's public institutions of higher education generally were helpful in carrying out this project and cautiously optimistic about its potential. However, one institutional administrator feared that talking about his successes with minority students would cause the commission to steal his good ideas and pay other schools to copy them. (In fact, the strategies that are working well at this school are the same ones that are working well elsewhere.)

Support for the idea that minority student achievement is a reflection of an institution's performance is still far from universal. But more and more institutions are taking an active interest in how to better allocate money to programs to improve the circumstances of minority students and faculty. Though Colorado colleges and universities are unlikely to attribute their interest in increasing minority achievement to commission activity, their interest is growing at the same time that further state action is anticipated.

Successful prospects

The work of phases two and three remains to be done and, as the state's proposal to SHEEO suggested, it is substantial. Once financial incentives to improve minority student participation have been defined and refined, they will need to be implemented. Policies that inhibit progress for minority students must be revised. Additionally, legislative initiatives that support the efforts of higher education institutions on this issue must be developed.

The SHEEO grant has strengthened the state's higher education minority policy-development agenda in three ways: (1) it now has the capacity to track the progress of minority students; (2) it has retention measures that can be used to measure the extent to which minority students are completing their educations; and (3) it has some sense of what helps or hinders minority students succeed. The challenge now is to continue moving on the agenda that the grant activities have helped to define.

Mark Chisholm, Martha Romero and Sharon Samson
Colorado Commission on Higher Education

State Profiles: Illinois

THE ILLINOIS CHALLENGE: IMPROVING MINORITY ACHIEVEMENT THROUGH TRANSFER

Throughout its history, the Illinois Board of Higher Education has been concerned about the participation and achievement of minority students in higher education. Since 1968, the board has followed a series of policies designed to improve minority student participation and achievement.

In 1985, the general assembly adopted legislation (P.A. 84-726) requiring public colleges and universities to submit to the board plans for increasing the participation of "under-represented groups." A 1987 amendment required the board to submit to the governor and general assembly each January a report evaluating institutional progress in increasing the participation of under-represented groups. Implicit in P.A. 84-726 is the goal of achieving minority student and staff representation in higher education that is equal to minority representation in Illinois' population.

Board action

At the same time, the general assembly passed P.A. 84-726 and, prompted by the same concerns, the board took two important actions. First, it recognized that the need to specifically increase the retention of minority students through baccalaureate degree completion and into graduate and professional programs was equal to the need to generally increase participation in higher education. To meet these needs, the board adopted four priorities for state and institutional program development and resource allocation:

1. Assisting schools with efforts to increase the high school completion rate for minorities
2. Preparing more minority high school students for baccalaureate degree programs
3. Increasing the baccalaureate degree completion rate for minorities
4. Expanding professional development opportunities for minorities in fields leading to graduate and professional degrees, especially in fields emphasizing mathematics and the sciences

Second, the board established a process for reporting on the participation and degree completion of minority students in higher education. Each July since 1986, the board has compiled and published a statistical report on the fall enrollment and the annual degree completion of students by race/ethnicity for all Illinois higher education institutions. Reports show that African American and Hispanic enrollment decreases statewide at each successive education level and that black and Hispanic students are less represented at the completion of each education level than they were in enrollment at that level.

Recognizing that higher education's ability to recruit more minority students rested, in part, upon more minority students completing high school, the board joined with the State Board of Education to appoint a Joint Committee on Minority Student Achievement. At the Joint Committee's recommendation, in its report entitled *Our Future at Risk*, both boards adopted the following policy statement in spring 1988:

> There is an urgent need to change the educational system in Illinois to improve the achievement of minority students. Efforts to bring about such change shall include making minority student achievement a priority in Illinois; providing support programs early and throughout education; promoting change in the school/campus environment for minority students; promoting an increase in the employment of minority teaching and administrative personnel; and monitoring programs and student progress closely.

Thus, in fall 1988, when SHEEO issued its request for proposals, the board already had in place state-level policies, some special funding programs and a mechanism for reporting on minority student participation and achievement statewide. However, the board had not for some time specifically examined the rate of transfer from associate to baccalaureate degree-granting institutions.

In its proposal to SHEEO, the board identified as its primary project goal increasing the number of minority students who transfer from associate to baccalaureate degree-granting institutions and who subsequently earn baccalaureate degrees. The board's fundamental strategies in carrying out the project were to give the issue of minority student transfer and degree completion statewide visibility and reinforce and sustain the collective commitment necessary to move the entire system forward toward goal achievement. The board recognized at the outset that the project's primary goal would not be attained in a single year. An on-going, long-term commitment by the board, the systems and individual campuses would be required.

A secondary goal of the project was the development of a comprehensive system to evaluate minority initiatives. An evaluation system was needed to identify model minority student recruitment and retention programs to more effectively allocate funds. To achieve this goal, project staff planned to gather information on the variety of programs provided by Illinois higher education institutions, design and test evaluation instruments, develop guidelines for reviewing grant applications and combine these elements together into a coherent evaluation process.

Laying the groundwork for new coalitions

The process for achieving the project's goals, as outlined in the board's proposal to SHEEO, was a simple step-by-step progression. The proposal described a process beginning with a review of the literature about the barriers to success and elements leading to successful transfer for minority students. The review was to serve as the basis for meetings with various higher education constituent groups throughout the state. Meetings, in turn, were to result in a comprehensive report that would lead to both the design of an evaluation process, revision of board policies and development of procedures for policy implementation. However, the actual process that emerged was more complex and multi-dimensional.

To seek and sustain commitment to project goals from public system offices and public and nonpublic institutions, meetings with system office staffs and site visits to institutions were held. Meetings and site visits served to: (1) increase visibility for minority student achievement and articulation and transfer issues across the state; (2) share information on actual and potential strategies for increasing minority student transfer and success; and (3) build consensus within the higher education community on optimum strategies and priorities.

A brief review of relevant literature was conducted prior to the meetings. A working paper resulted from the review that described the need for increasing minority student achievement and potential strategies for community colleges and baccalaureate institutions to increase minority student transfer, retention and degree completion rates. The working paper continuously was revised as a result of suggestions made during meetings and site visits.

Four recurring themes, recorded in a progress report, emerged from the site visits:

- Minority students need encouragement, accurate information and guidance throughout the education process, beginning in elementary school and continuing through college.
- Faculty members need to be more involved in developing and maintaining program and course articulation agreements between and among institutions.
- A hospitable climate on individual campuses needs to be developed for members of minority groups.

- Adequate financial aid needs to be provided to minority students and sufficient funding to programs designed to increase minority student retention.

The progress report outlined ways to address the recurring themes by revising state policy and its implementation through state-level budget, planning and monitoring processes. With help from the media, the progress report received widespread visibility for the project and the transfer issue. Information gathered from the literature review, meetings and site visits ultimately resulted in revised policies that were adopted by the board and were incorporated into the *Master Plan Policies of the Illinois Board of Higher Education*.

Evaluating the work

The evaluation system development process began with an evaluation design for one of the state's existing competitive grant programs. The mid-year progress and end-of-year reports required from institutions that receive Higher Education Cooperation Act (HECA) Minority Educational Achievement Grants were revised. Student participation and outcomes data, such as test scores, school attendance, high school graduation and college enrollment, retention and graduation, were requested in addition to expenditure data.

Development of a comprehensive evaluation process has resulted in the identification of:

- Program characteristics that lead to the desired outcomes at different educational levels and to their incorporation into the RFP process for program grants. (While these success-producing characteristics were identified while evaluating grant-funded programs, they are applicable to all programs at the same level no matter the source of funding.)
- New programmatic areas to address newly identified needs. (For example, one of the recurring themes in the September 1989 SHEEO project progress report was the need for institutions to create a campus climate more hospitable to minority students. To assist institutions in addressing this issue, the board awarded a HECA Minority Educational Achievement grant in funding year 1990 to a consortium of public and nonpublic universities to refine and pilot test a set of instruments to measure campus climate.)
- A more effective process of targeting funding to minority initiatives

In addition to developing an evaluation process for competitive grant programs, project staff also began to develop guidelines for evaluating public institutions' efforts to improve the participation and achievement of minorities, women and disabled students.

When the board requested that the state's public universities and community colleges submit progress reports and improvement plans, they were not given formal directions for preparing them. So not surprisingly, there was little comparability among institutions in the level of specificity within their plans or in the kinds of information gathered and reported as a baseline from which to evaluate future progress. To make the reports more useable in evaluating institutions' efforts, guidelines were developed.

The guidelines were used by institutions to prepare their 1989 annual reports. As a result, the kinds of information provided and level of specificity were more consistent from institution to institution. From the information, the board was able to determine not only ongoing institutional efforts, but also institutional initiatives undertaken during the previous year.

The evaluation and guideline development processes involved regular consultation with those who would be affected by it. Project directors were consulted in the development of the evaluation process for competitive grant programs. Public system academic officers were involved in the development of the guidelines for annual progress reports and plans. This consultation process has resulted in an evaluation system with widespread acceptance.

Characteristics of Successful Programs for Minority Students

Pre-college Programs

Programs that encourage and prepare minority students for college:

- Encourage academic achievement and develop good study skills through structured, hands-on classes in communication, mathematics, science or computer use, and individual or small-group tutoring
- Develop peer support groups among student participants
- Create socialization and mentoring opportunities such as minority role models as mentors or as guest speakers, internships in commerce or industry, or field trips to museums, research labs, businesses, and college and university campuses to emphasize career opportunities
- Explore and identify career interests, including information on college admission and financial aid requirements, procedures and applications
- Involve parents in the education of their children through orientation meetings or home visits, written commitments to support children's participation in the program, participation in speaker sessions or field trips, and information on college admission and financial aid requirements and procedures
- Involve members of the local minority community in identifying potential student participants, providing mentors, speakers and internship sites, and providing tutoring sites and visits
- Provide continuous monitoring and after-program follow-up of individual students' academic progress

Collegiate-level Programs

Programs successful in retaining minority students in college:

- Provide orientation or transition experiences to socialize incoming students (and their parents or spouses) to the college's expectations and environment
- Assess entry skills and provide follow-up support, such as coursework, supplemental course sections, study skills development, study groups and tutoring
- Provide continuous monitoring of individual student academic achievement and intrusive academic advising
- Offer career exploration seminars and individual career counseling
- Create a supportive environment, including a peer support group or network, role models and mentors, and social and cultural activities
- Counsel students on financial aid and financial management

Transfer Centers

Centers that increase the number of students who transfer from associate to baccalaureate degree-granting institutions:

- Are centrally located, easily accessible and highly visible on campus. These centers house articulation and transfer information and coordinate articulation and transfer activities
- Are directed by a full-time professional who reports directly to a top-level campus administrator and has appropriate clerical support
- Identify potential transfer students, introduce them to transfer opportunities, monitor individual student academic progress and conduct follow-up of students after transfer
- Advise potential transfer students on the transfer process, institution and program choice, and program and course selection and articulation

(continued on next page)

- Facilitate visits by students to baccalaureate institutions, meetings between successful alumni transfers and current students, interinstitutional faculty articulation meetings, and visits by representatives of baccalaureate institutions to campus
- Refer students to other campus offices for financial aid, registration, tutoring, assessment, and career counseling and planning, and serve as an ombudsman
- Provide outreach to community groups and area schools to encourage college attendance and to inform students, parents, counselors, teachers and others in the community of available baccaluareate completion opportunities through transfer
- Offer social activities and mentoring by peer transfer advisors, faculty members or community professionals
- Provide accurate, up-to-date and user-friendly course and program articulation documentation
- Are advised by a committee representing associate and baccalaureate institution faculty and student services staffs, community members, high school personnel, and current students and alumni

Articulation Agreements

Interinstitutional articulation agreements that are successful in increasing the number of students who transfer and in eliminating loss or duplication of credit:

- Are supported by the commitment to articulation and leadership by campus administrators and actively involve faculty members from both institutions
- Secure faculty agreement on course or program objectives and standards
- Offer dual admission or concurrent enrollment of students
- Are widely published with annual review and updating, including publication in both institutions' catalogues and joint brochures and dissemination through computerized advising systems
- Provide articulation of the process, as well as the curricular substance, of student transfer from one institution to the other

Graduate and First-Professional Programs

Programs successful in recruiting and retaining minority students through graduate completion or graduation include:

- Graduate fellowships or tuition-waivers, as well as funds for books, supplies, and conference or research travel
- Socialization and mentoring opportunities such as a peer support group or network, faculty or practicing professionals as mentors, and research or practicum opportunities
- Job search and placement assistance
- Continuous monitoring and follow-up of students' academic progress

Favorable outcomes

The primary outcomes of the project include a high degree of statewide visibility for the project and its goals, revisions to board transfer and articulation policies, establishment of benchmarks from which to measure progress in achieving the project's goals, an evaluation system that has led to the development of new programs and a more effective process for awarding state funds for minority initiatives, and a new Minority Articulation Program to support interinstitutional efforts to improve the transfer of minority students.

These intermediate outcomes are expected to lead to achievement of the project's primary goal of increasing minority student participation in, transfer to and completion of baccalaureate degrees.

Meetings and site visits, as well as periodic reports to the board, raised visibility for the project and its goals. Visibility was further enhanced by a series of articles about the transfer issue that appeared in the *Chicago Sun-Times*.

Several recent actions by institutions and systems prove that the project's visibility has

helped to gain commitment to its goals. Actions include:

- A statement by the board urging each of the state's universities to focus more attention on minority transfer student recruitment and support
- Appointment by Governors State University, an upper-division university, of an articulation and transfer coordinator to spend half-time at each of its two closest feeder community college campuses
- A recent chancellor's report to the Board of Trustees of City Colleges of Chicago devoted to efforts to revitalize the baccalaureate-transfer program within the City Colleges
- Consensus on articulation and transfer policies achieved by the Committee on the Study of Undergraduate Education and the general assembly and governor, resulting in funding for the Minority Articulation Program. (Receipt of 44 proposals, many of which contained substantial institutional matching funds, for grants from this new program also suggests a high level of institutional commitment to achieving the project's goals.)

A collaborative approach to problem solving

Through efforts of the Illinois Community College Board, Transfer Coordinators of Illinois Colleges and Universities and individual colleges and universities, the transfer of students and process of articulation have been reasonably effective. In recent years, however, complaints by students of losing credit in transfer or needing to repeat a course after transfer seemed to be growing. In addition, board policies adopted in 1986 required institutions to define objectives for and review and assess the effectiveness of undergraduate education. These policies seem to have further eroded program articulation efforts among institutions as each institution developed new, often unique, general education requirements. Finally, data from the 1989 progress reports suggested that the rate of transfer among minority students may be declining.

Because of these problems or findings, the Committee on the Study of Undergraduate Education recommended that the board adopt seven transfer and articulation policy statements. These statements emphasize the concept of equal partnership among associate and baccalaureate institutions in providing the first two years of baccalaureate degree programs. The statements also:

- Establish a mechanism for assuring compatibility between associate and baccalaureate institution general education requirements
- Make campus presidents and chief academic officers responsible for implementing interinstitutional articulation arrangements and resolving differences
- Make faculties of both associate and baccalaureate degree-granting institutions responsible for developing articulation agreements and for promoting compatibility in curricula
- Recognize that making the transfer process as smooth as possible is a joint responsibility
- Call upon the board, in cooperation with the Illinois Community College Board and baccalaureate degree-granting institutions, to establish a statewide system to monitor the progress of students who transfer. This system will for the first time provide community and junior colleges follow-up information on the after-transfer success of their former students needed to review and improve their programs and services. The system also will provide data the board needs to monitor institutional and statewide progress in achieving the project's goal.

State funding increases

As a result of funding priorities adopted in 1985 to improve minority student participation throughout the education pipeline, many funding increases have been made. At the recommendation of the board, $3.5 million in new state funds were appropriated to public universities for minority student initiatives in fiscal year 1990. In fiscal year 1989, public universities reported spending more than $24 million, exclusive of

state and federal financial aid, on programs designed to serve under-represented groups. Such programs include early outreach or identification programs, admission and orientation programs, summer bridge and transition programs, support services, social and cultural programming, and faculty and staff recruitment efforts. Funding comes from a variety of sources, including internally reallocated funds, external grants and gifts.

The state's Monetary Award Program (MAP), which provides need-based financial grants to undergraduates, also represents a significant resource to support the education of minority students. Because MAP awards are allocated irrespective of gender or racial/ethnic origin, data on recipients are not collected on this basis. From the annual financial aid survey, however, it is known that African Americans, Hispanics and Native Americans constitute 33.7% of those receiving MAP awards.

Funding also was increased in fiscal year 1990 for the competitive grant programs administered by the board. Funding for the Illinois Consortium for Educational Opportunity program nearly tripled. This grant, as well as the Illinois Minority Graduate Incentive Program funded through HECA, is designed to increase the representation of minorities in Illinois college and university faculties.

Funding for Minority Educational Achievement grants increased in fiscal year 1990 by nearly 50%. As a result of the evaluation process described earlier, some shifts were made in the types of programs supported and the level of support for each type.

In addition to the state's extensive financial aid programs, the board increased the ceiling placed on allowable public university undergraduate tuition waivers from 2% to 3% of the institution's total annual undergraduate tuition revenue. At least one public university system has dedicated the increase to providing assistance to minority undergraduates.

Through supplemental legislation in December 1989, the general assembly created a Minority Articulation Program within HECA and authorized $1 million for the program. Funds have been used to establish several transfer centers. (A transfer center is a physical entity on campus that serves as a focus for activities to encourage, guide and inform students about transfer opportunities and the process involved in transfer.)

Upcoming activities

Although considerable progress has been made in putting in place the state-level policies and processes necessary to achieve the project's goals, much remains to be done. Commitment must be sustained and rewarded; evaluation processes and monitoring systems need to be refined and expanded; funding for minority initiatives needs to be institutionalized; and collaboration in the use of limited resources needs to be increased at both the state and local levels among public schools, higher education institutions and human service agencies.

To maintain visibility and sustain commitment, the board will continue to publish its statistical report on the participation and achievement of minority students and its annual report to the governor and general assembly on efforts by public institutions to increase participation and achievement of currently under-represented groups. In addition, the board, along with the Illinois Community College Board, will convene a meeting of institution presidents to monitor implementation of the recommended transfer and articulation policies and establish a resolution procedure for articulation problems. Finally, implementation of the recommended transfer and articulation policies, as well as procedures for monitoring and reporting student progress, will continue to be included on the agenda of the public system academic officers' regular meetings with board staff.

The evaluation and monitoring systems will continue to be refined and expanded. The completion of two full cycles of evaluation of the various minority-related competitive grant programs should permit identification of model programs. In addition to incorporating model program characteristics into RFP processes, information about these programs needs to be compiled and more widely disseminated to encourage replication by other institutions.

The statewide system for monitoring the after-transfer success of students who transfer from associate to baccalaureate institutions will be developed. In addition, existing public uni-

versity high school feedback and baccalaureate student retention and graduation monitoring systems need to be expanded to include nonpublic institutions that choose to participate. Finally, information from these progress monitoring systems needs to be incorporated into an annual statewide report to the board, as well as into such processes as program approval and review and budget formulation.

Campus programs to serve minority students need to be both consolidated and institutionalized. In their October 1989 progress reports, public universities identified 264 separately organized efforts to recruit and retain students and staff from under-represented groups. This large number of separate programs suggests that efforts are fragmented across campus and among colleges and departments. Programs that have proven to be successful need to be incorporated into the institution's regular budget, rather than primarily supported by external grants.

A final issue that needs to be addressed is increased collaboration among public schools, higher education institutions and human service agencies in the delivery of programs for minority students.

The board will continue to work with the State Board of Education both at the staff level and through the Joint Education Committee to address issues of mutual concern and to coordinate programs and services to expand opportunities and promote achievement of minority students at all education levels.

The Illinois Board of Higher Education believes strongly that schools, higher education institutions, the state and federal governments and private enterprise all need to work together to increase the level of education attainment of all citizens for the individual, states and nation to prosper.

Ann Bragg
Illinois Board of Higher Education

State Profiles: Massachusetts

INCREASING STUDENT TRANSFER: A SOLUTION TO THE MINORITY TEACHER SHORTAGE IN MASSACHUSETTS

Massachusetts mirrors the disturbing national trend that shows minority students over-represented in community colleges and under-represented at four-year institutions. The consequence of this trend is that students who enter community colleges are less likely to obtain bachelor's degrees than students who begin their baccalaureate programs at four-year schools.

There are other troubling patterns of minority student participation within the Massachusetts public higher education system. From 1978 to 1986, African American student enrollment increased by 41% and Hispanic enrollment more than doubled; but unfortunately, the graduation rate for blacks decreased by 20% and the rate for Hispanics increased only modestly, by 26%. During the same period, Native Americans suffered a decline in enrollments and graduation rates.

One avenue for improving minority student graduation rates is by increasing the transfer rate of students from community colleges to four-year institutions. Some of the reasons that students are not transferring include:

- Lack of academic preparation
- Inability to receive credit for community college courses at four-year schools
- Lack of information about four-year schools
- Financial difficulties
- Personal considerations

Another cause for alarm in higher education, and education in general, is the anticipated minority teacher shortage. The crisis is most acutely apparent in urban schools, which are disproportionately populated with minority children. In efforts to have faculties reflect community demographics, urban school districts find themselves chasing an extremely small pool of minority applicants.

Beginning in 1987, the Massachussetts Board of Regents reviewed undergraduate education policies and made several changes to improve the quality of education. Among the changes were new standards for teacher certification that will require all potential teachers to complete a baccalaureate in the liberal arts and sciences. Additionally, a revised Transfer Compact expanded the number of students (from 10% to 25%) who are eligible for transfer without experiencing loss of course credit.

Collaboration as a remedy

The board used the opportunity afforded by the SHEEO grant to further its efforts. The Collaborative Teacher Preparation Program was designed and implemented to recruit minority community college students and prepare them for eventual entry into teacher training, baccalaureate-granting programs at four-year institutions.

Specifically, the board used grant monies to fund two pilot projects through the Collaborative Teacher Education Program. Through these funded projects, minority students on community college campuses were recruited into a jointly developed teacher education program. The services provided through the programs will facilitate their graduation from the community college and successful transfer to the four-year institution. Pilot project goals set by the board included:

- Two- and four-year institutions would collaborate to develop programs to recruit minority students into teacher training.
- Working together, institutions would address the perceived cultural differences between two- and four-year campuses.

- Institutions would increase transfer rates of minority students into four-year teacher education programs.

Pilot project activities were to include:

- Curriculum development
- Creation of opportunities for field experience
- Provision of support services
- Development of appropriate competencies and standards
- Evaluation of their success

In addition to the pilot project goals, the board developed a set of broader goals designed to improve the articulation of two- and four-year campuses:

- General education programs would be improved through the development of systemwide guidelines facilitating transfer.
- Communication and joint-planning between two- and four-year schools would be improved.
- A statewide policy requiring regional collaborative degrees would be established.
- Accountability and tracking of the transfer process between two- and four-year schools would be improved.

The funded pilot projects represented a collaboration between the University of Massachusetts Boston Harbor Campus and Roxbury Community College and a consortium of Bridgewater State College, Massasoit Community College and Bristol Community College. Prior to final acceptance of the proposals, both groups were asked to review their records and provide information as to the number of minority students who transferred into a teacher preparation program in 1988.

University of Massachusetts at Boston and Roxbury Community College. The University of Massachusetts at Boston (UMB) is a doctoral-granting university within the Massachusetts university system. It offers 27 baccalaureate and master's programs leading to teacher certification or certification as an education specialist. These programs are accredited by the Department of Education, and the university participates in the Interstate Certification Compact.

Located within the city of Boston, Roxbury Community College (RCC) has a mission to serve minority students. As such, it is the only postsecondary institution in New England with a predominantly minority population. Of its 2,800 students, approximately 58% are African American, 21% are Hispanic and 2% are Native Americans. To recruit RCC students into the Collaborative Teacher Education Program, posters and brochures were produced; the College Survival Seminar, a required course about the program for first-year students, was developed; and faculty members and counselors were enlisted to identify and recruit students for entry into the program. (While not originally foreseen in the design of the program, RCC also is relying on some existing contacts with local high schools to begin the promotion of teaching as a career choice.)

After applying to the program, students are selected based on their interest in teaching, current enrollment or intention to enroll in a liberal arts or early childhood transfer program, English competency as indicated by placement in college-level courses and a cumulative grade point average (for continuing students) of at least 2.5. Students meeting the academic requirements for entry also are interviewed. Upon acceptance into the program, students receive conditional admission to the university and are eligible for financial aid.

Since support services play a critical role in assuring the successful completion of four-year degrees, students in the Collaborative Teacher Education Program are assigned both an academic advisor and a special faculty advisor. In addition, students attend specially designed workshops conducted by UMB and RCC faculty and staff. They also are invited to participate in workshops offered to Boston Public School teachers.

Special features of the UMB/RCC pilot project include:

- A comprehensive system of support for students while they are still at Roxbury
- Enlistment of advanced education students from the university to recruit and mentor incoming students
- A three-credit field experience course at UMB that students may take during their second year in the program
- A one-credit colloquium series with guest speakers supplemented by pre- and post-colloquium seminars led by university faculty

Bridgewater State College, Massasoit Community College and Bristol Community College. Bridgewater State College (BSC) is an accredited four-year college located in eastern Massachusetts. It offers 32 programs leading to teacher certification and certification in a variety of education specialties. The programs are accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education and qualify under the Interstate Certification Compact.

Massasoit Community College (MCC), located in Brockton, and Bristol Community College (BCC), located in Fall River, are accredited two-year institutions.

Minority students actively are recruited into the Collaborative Teacher Education Program on all three campuses. Various organizations providing counseling services on the three campuses also actively recruit students. Brochures are available at a variety of locations and are distributed to area high schools. Qualified minority students are identified and contacted by staff and faculty involved in the program.

MCC and BCC students in the program are guaranteed admission in BSC upon completion of an associate's degree in liberal arts or elementary education. High school students recruited into the program have the option of a dual admission.

Special features of the BSC/MCC/BCC pilot project include:

- A Minorities in Teaching Council, composed of faculty from the three campuses and members of the local communities. The council provides oversight of the program, assists in recruitment of students and provides support
- Assignment of "buddies" to community college students to help them become oriented with the BSC campus
- Special tutoring and identification of a support network for students
- Five scholarships, funded by a private donor, specifically for students in the program

Success measured in numbers

The ultimate success of the Collaborative Teacher Education Program can only be measured in numbers over the long-term, therefore it is appropriate only to consider the short-term goals of the program and evaluate the extent to which the pilot projects have succeeded at implementing their proposed features. (It should be noted that even if the program were extremely successful, the total number of students involved would not be large. Yet, even a modest number of students successfully completing the program would represent a substantial increase in the number of minority community college students who successfully complete teacher training programs.)

Following recruitment efforts at RCC, about 20 students had expressed interest in the program and 12 were accepted. Of these, nine continued through it.

The colloquium series became the de facto core experience of the program. Through regular attendance, students engaged in a dialogue about the teaching profession and interacted with professionals in the education field. The seminars also allowed students to have regular contact with University of Massachusetts at Boston faculty and administrators. Maintaining this contact has equipped RCC students with the confidence to make greater use of UMB, including cross-registration in classes at the university.

The UMB and RCC campuses are fairly close to one another. The initial hope was that holding the colloquium series at UMB would

help introduce students to the university. Unfortunately, this posed difficulties for some students who weren't able to accommodate travel time within their schedules. In response, the majority of seminars were relocated to the RCC campus.

Two UMB students were recruited to mentor RCC students. (As RCC students successfully transfer, they provide a pool of mentors for the next generation of transferring RCC students.)

Student mentors and program coordinators maintained regular contact with students and tried to address every concern they may have had. This function, although perhaps not foreseen in the original proposal, became a key component of the program. The accessibility of such individuals appears to have served three important functions: students obtained accurate and thoughtful responses to any concerns they had; the university, often an intimidating place at first, was demystified and humanized; and the process of dealing with two bureaucratic structures was simplified.

Compared to Roxbury Community College, the minority population at Bridgewater State College, Massasoit Community College and Bristol Community College is small. During the first year, one BSC student, nine MCC students and three BCC students participated in the program. To help support these students, faculty and administrators provided visible minority role models and acted as advocates or counselors.

Social events, incorporated into the project as an informal means of bringing students, faculty and administrators together, became the project's most important feature. Students used their familiarity with these individuals to help them resolve problems and have their concerns addressed.

What was less than successful, however, were efforts to bring students from the various campuses together. The three campuses are located in generally the same region of Massachusetts, but are not readily accessible to one another. Indeed, the only practical means of transit is by car, and in each case the round-trip transit time is considerable.

Despite the distance between them, the three campuses have maintained a network of administrators and faculty involved in the program. The network meets regularly and rotates the meeting location. In addition, the Minorities in Teaching Council advises the program and maintains contact with members of the community beyond the campuses.

Small numbers, big successes

Because of the limited number of minority students involved in the Collaborative Teacher Education Program, baccalaureate degree completion plus acquisition of provisional teacher certification by at least 50% of the students initially accepted into the program would be a success. On the other hand, the total number of students involved in the program thus far may be considerably short of the potential, at least at Roxbury Community College.

The following briefly reviews the stated goals of the project and discusses how well those goals have been achieved:

- Two- and four-year institutions would collaborate to develop programs to recruit minority students into teacher training. The institutions that received grants successfully developed pilot projects to achieve this goal. To the extent that most of the planned program features have been implemented, the programs appear successful.
- Working together, the institutions would address the perceived cultural differences between two- and four-year campuses. The UMB/RCC collaboration has succeeded in introducing community college students to university life. The students appear to have gained confidence to work directly with university faculty and administrators and make use of university facilities. Efforts that have added to the success include: the willingness of UMB faculty to meet RCC students at Roxbury; the participation of RCC students in activities held at UMB; and the time invested by student mentors to make RCC students feel welcome.

  Because of the physical distance between BSC, MCC and BCC campuses, there has

been limited opportunity for BSC representatives to visit the community colleges, and attempts to bring community college students to BSC have not been very successful. However, community college students received competent counseling and a high degree of responsiveness from their on-campus program representatives. While this may not directly familiarize them with the culture of a four-year institution, it does directly address some of their transfer concerns, untangle some of the bureaucratic red tape and demystify the process.

- The institutions would increase transfer rates of minority students into the four-year college's teacher education programs. The impact on transfer has not yet been felt at the time of this writing. Nonetheless, even if the dropout rate for the program were to be unexpectedly high, the improvement over historical numbers of minority students transferring into teacher certification programs will be dramatic.

- General education programs would be improved through the development of systemwide guidelines to facilitate transfer.

- The board has developed new systemwide policies that improve the articulation of general education programs. The schools involved in the Collaborative Teacher Education Program have used these transfer policies to help them with planning and course development.

- Communication and joint planning between two- and four-year schools would be improved. Collaboration and joint planning have been essential to the Collaborative Teacher Education Program, and the program has built some channels for future communication among campuses.

- A statewide policy requiring regional collaborative degrees would be established.

- The Collaborative Teacher Education Program has not impacted regional collaboration agreements, but it has established a collaboration model between two- and four-year schools located near one another.

- Accountability and tracking of the transfer process between two- and four-year schools would be improved. Because the number of students involved in the program is small, there have been no obstacles to individually monitoring their progress through the program.

While direct funding of the Collaborative Teacher Education Program has ended, many important program features are in place and should continue for some time. Contact between the various campuses has ensured that students will have a reliable means of accessing information about teacher education and transfer. Also, community college students can enter directed programs offering them the best chance of successfully completing a teacher education program.

The program has been important in two other ways as well. First, the program addresses a critical need in Massachusetts — the need for more minority teachers. Even though the number of students involved in the program is small, they could have a significant impact on the pool of qualified minority applicants available to fill teaching positions in the state's urban schools. Second, this is a model that can be replicated in other disciplines. The program is an example of how the transfer function of community colleges can be changed to encourage minority students to complete four-year degree programs.

Marion Darlington-Hope
and George Lowery
Massachusetts Board of Regents

State Profiles: Montana

MONTANA "TRACKS": A STATE'S COMMITMENT TO AMERICAN INDIAN EDUCATION

American Indians are the only significant minority group in Montana.

- In the state's population of 800,000, there are approximately 50,000 American Indians with a median age of 19 as compared to 29 years for the non-Indian population.
- According to the 1980 census, approximately 80% of the state's non-Indian students complete high school, but only 50% of the Indian student population completes high school.
- Total student enrollment in the state's four-year institutions during the academic year 1986-87 was 30,661. Only 768 students were American Indians — a mere 2.5%.
- Of the baccalaureate degrees awarded in 1986-87, only 1.6% were awarded to American Indians.

In 1972, Montana's constitution was redrafted to include a provision for American Indians:

> The state recognizes the distinct and unique cultural heritage of the American Indians and is committed in its educational goals to the preservation of their cultural integrity (Article X, Section 1(2).

Redrafting the constitution was an act of enlightenment in education by the Montana legislature. Another act of enlightenment occurred in 1973. Legislation passed specified that by 1979 only certified personnel with training in American Indian studies could be employed in schools with a significant Indian population. Furthermore, in 1974 the legislature directed the Board of Public Education and the Board of Regents to "develop a master plan for enriching the background of all public school teachers in American Indian culture." And in 1975, the Montana Indian Culture Master Plan was adopted by the State Joint Board of Education.

Unfortunately, this level of commitment was not sustained. The 1979 legislature, under heavy political pressure from teachers and administrators, made the Indian studies requirement optional and basically negated the 1972 constitutional provision. Sadly, the Montana Indian Culture Master Plan, together with the American Indian student, faded into obscurity.

The American Indian student became virtually invisible in Montana's educational system during the 1980s. It seemed that state education policy makers held themselves removed from, and almost unaccountable for, the plight of American Indians. American Indian participation and achievement was not even an issue in state education policy discussions. The result was immense damage to the credibility of the state's goodwill and governance regarding American Indian education.

Fortunately, a national commitment was being made to better educate *all* American children. This commitment filtered into Montana, and a greater awareness of Indian students' needs began to evolve.

Several occurrences in the late 1980s helped in this evolution. A 1988 study was initiated by the commissioner of higher education to determine why American Indian students were not entering and succeeding in the Montana University System. The study revealed: (1) demographics on American Indian students were virtually non-existent, and (2) there were blatant disparities between non-Indian and Indian participation and achievement in Montana's educational system.

Second, the Committee on Indian Affairs had joined with the Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education to study the issues of Indian education and achievement. Their task was

difficult because little or no data or tracking mechanisms existed.

Finally, the newly elected superintendent of public instruction openly was committed to improving Indian education, and she recognized the need for greater collaboration between the secondary and postsecondary systems.

With these initial efforts under way, a proposal was submitted to and a grant awarded by SHEEO to develop and implement the Montana "Tracks" Project: American Indians in Education.

Receipt of the SHEEO grant was extremely beneficial. Once again, Indian education gained new visibility and current efforts were fortified. Unfortunately, the historical impediments of indifference and mistrust continually had to be contended with as "Tracks" attempted to achieve its goals.

Goals prescribe work

"Tracks"' goals were to:

1. Design a database and tracking system to monitor American Indian participation and performance at every education level
2. Develop specific statewide goals with implementation activities and time-lines to increase American Indian participation and performance
3. Develop a strategy to gain legislative support for specific efforts designed to enhance American Indian education involvement and achievement

"Tracks" hired a qualified and professional Indian educator as project coordinator, which allowed the project more quickly to gain American Indian commitment, respect and trust.

A task force was assembled that included Indian and non-Indian officials from each reservation and each major education entity. Through the task force, Indian and non-Indian leaders came together as colleagues to discuss the status of Indian education and the state's responsibility to serve the needs of American Indian children.

When the task force first convened, it wrestled with several questions. They included:

- At what points are American Indian students being lost in the education pipeline?
- How many American Indian students are in college preparatory courses versus non-Indian students?
- What percent of American Indian high school graduates enroll in higher education?
- What is meant by "American Indian"?
- What does the term "dropout" mean?

The task force believed that one way to find answers to some of these questions was through the development of a comprehensive database and tracking system. As the project coordinator explored data systems, it became clear that individual student records were necessary. And legislative and policy decisions were necessary to collect the data. Furthermore, the process of conducting meetings, efforts to arrive at consensus on the data elements to be collected, development of a way to collect and report data, and building a system to house and analyze the collected data all proved to be more time-consuming and costly than originally anticipated.

The design of the database was conceptualized to occur in three successive stages. First, demographic elements needed to be determined. Second, elements such as test scores, grade retention and other similar information needed to be determined. Third, the impact of socioeconomic and cultural elements needed to be addressed.

Fears surface

Access to records and use of resulting data were primary topics of discussion within the task force. Some members feared that collected data would not result in development of meaningful intervention and remedial strategies, but rather would be used by educators, legislators and others to reinforce widely held ethnic stereotypes, or even negate any affirmative action of the past.

A tentative solution to this persistent stumbling block was the development of a draft policy on data confidentiality. The draft policy, though vague, put the state on notice that the tribes required adequate assurance as to the use of any statistics collected on them.

Other early achievements included defining "American Indian" and getting the definition endorsed by the board, the Montana Advisory Committee on Indian Education and other appropriate entities. The definition was used to more accurately and completely identify American Indians within the public education systems. At the elementary and secondary levels, a survey was sent to school superintendents to determine the number of American Indians enrolled in their schools. Also, with input from the Montana University System registrars and admission officers, an addendum to the Uniform Application for Admission was developed. It included the official American Indian definition, as well as requested students' tribal affiliation.

Another very important achievement was consensus that any and all outcomes of "Tracks" become the letter of the law within education and institutional policies and procedures, not subject to the caprices of elected officials and political appointments.

After the design of the database was under way, the question of follow-up procedures was raised. Once a student exited the education system at any point, who was responsible for the follow-up? The state or the tribes? Since "Tracks" was a Montana University System program, the responsibility for tracking and monitoring belonged to the state. The tribes acknowledged their responsibility and desire to collaborate with the state system, but the clear understanding was this was to be done as a supplementary effort.

Specific forms were developed and to be used during personal interviews with students who dropped out of secondary or postsecondary education. The recorded information would be entered into the database and allow dropout patterns to be identified. This would then lead to the design of intervention and remedial strategies.

The goal of the project was to reveal breakdown points in the education pipeline and generate appropriate recommendations to state policy makers. These recommendations, together with a statistical profile of the current status of Indian education in Montana comprised the final product of "Tracks" — the State Plan for Indian Education. To make it responsive to the problems revealed by the evolving database, the plan annually will be updated and subject to public hearings.

Outcomes and impacts

"Tracks" has accomplished its intended goals plus several others:

- There is an official count of how many American Indian students are in Montana's education system. Ten percent of the kindergarten through eighth grade student population is American Indian, and 7% of the high school population is American Indian.
- An emerging comprehensive database and permanent collection, tracking and reporting mechanisms are in place to help hold the state accountable for student achievement.
- For the first time there is a coordinated partnership between the state and tribes to track and monitor the welfare of Indian students. The potential for American Indian students to quietly disappear through the cracks and crevices of Montana's education pipeline is greatly diminished.
- New staff — a director of American Indian/minority achievement — was added to the Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education. This made Indian involvement and achievement facts of life within the Montana University System and the state education community as a whole.
- Indian education as a major policy issue has re-emerged.
- Tribal colleges were given a voice and long over-due recognition for the vital role they play. (Before "Tracks," tribal college presidents had not been invited to Board of Regents' meetings. After "Tracks," they have a standing invitation to attend all board meetings.)
- The Montana University System has revised its role and scope statement to

include specific mention of the system's responsibilities to American Indian students.

- Definitive policies have emerged and will become institutionalized within the Montana University System.
- The Montana Committee for American Indian Higher Education has been formed to be a more active, unified and broadly representative voice for American Indians.
- A statewide working conference on American Indians in higher education featured prestigious national presenters and served to significantly increase awareness and discussion of the issue.
- A public forum on Indian education was held and received statewide media coverage, again increasing awareness.
- The Legislative Committee on Indian Affairs is committed to the issue of Indian education and set the stage for decisive action on the State Plan for Indian Education.

Ensuring progress

These recent accomplishments must be sustained. Public advocacy must not only be continued but also increased. The Board of Regents must not abdicate but expand its leadership role regarding Indian education. Campus presidents also must assume a leadership role and develop and implement plans designed to achieve education equality and multicultural diversity. Vocational-technical centers and community and private colleges must be brought into the process. The close working relationship between the Office of Public Instruction and the Office of Commissioner of Higher Education must become permanent. The legislature must make available permanent financial support for "Tracks." Furthermore, "Tracks"' final product — the State Plan for Indian Education — must be completed. It will embody specific guidelines for state education policy makers to follow to achieve "Tracks"' over-arching goal — increasing the baccalaureate completion rates of American Indians in Montana.

Most importantly, "Tracks" came into being to address issues in Indian education. Not only was it logical to include Indians in this process, but it was also a benchmark of respect. "Tracks" made it clear that in any future study of education that impacts Indians, Indians must be included as equal partners. In the end, tribal leaders and educators trusted to the goodwill of the state governance. This trust must be honored.

Rene Dubay
Office of the Commissioner
of Higher Education
Montana University System

Board Policy on Minority Achievement in the Montana University System

The Board of Regents recognizes the desirability for campus environments to promote multicultural diversity and for the participation and achievement of American Indian and other minority students to be, at a minimum, equal to their representation in the state's population. To that end, the board pledges its cooperation with the Board of Public Education, the Office of Public Instruction, American Indian tribal colleges and other American Indian and other minority entities with the state. The board adopts the following goals for higher education in Montana:

1. To enroll and graduate American Indians and other minorities in proportion to their representation in the state's population. In measuring the outcome of this goal, it is expected the students would originate from the State of Montana and the proportional representation would apply both at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Further, it is expected that the minority students would have comparable levels of achievement with non-minority students.

2. To increase the employment of American Indians and other under-represented minorities in administrative, faculty and staff positions to achieve representation equal to that of the relevant labor force

3. To enhance the overall curriculum by infusion of content which enhances multicultural awareness and understanding

Procedures:

In consultation with the Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education, each campus president or director will develop an action plan to accomplish the system goals for multicultural diversity. The plans are to be submitted to the Board of Regents. The commission will establish a deadline for submission of campus action plans so those plans can be implemented September 1, 1991. Action results will periodically be submitted to the commissioner who will make available such results to interested parties and to the general public.

State Profiles: New York

INCREASING THE NUMBER OF MINORITY TEACHERS IN NEW YORK: A LESSON IN JOINT PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

New York State has a lasting commitment to provide equal opportunity to all who desire a postsecondary education, regardless of age, race, sex, creed, national origin, geographic location, economic status or handicapping condition. This commitment has transformed the state's higher education system from one that served a few to one that serves many.

Efforts to increase the higher education enrollment of under-represented groups included the establishment of community colleges, open admissions at the City University of New York, the Tuition Assistance Program and the Education Opportunity Programs for economically and educationally disadvantaged college students.

Thus, as the minority population has grown, minority enrollments also have grown:

- From 1972 to 1982, minority enrollments at all levels of higher education increased from 14% to 19.5%.
- African American enrollment increased by 38%, Native Americans by 88%, Hispanics by 100% and Asians by 137%.
- During the mid 1980s, the actual number of minority undergraduates continued to increase but at a slower rate. Between 1980 and 1986, black enrollment increased by 4% and Hispanics by 23%.

Despite these increases, the 1988 Regents Statewide Plan for the Development of Postsecondary Education in New York State reported that:

- Black and Hispanic students drop out of four-year colleges at higher rates than their white counterparts.
- Only 30% of black and Hispanic students who entered four-year programs between 1978 and 1981 received their undergraduate degrees by spring 1985, compared to 50% of white students.
- Twenty-four percent of black students and 22% of Hispanic students who entered two-year degree programs between 1981 and 1983 completed them by spring 1985. Thirty percent of white students completed the same programs.

To compound these problems, two- and four-year institutions put up roadblocks to successful completion. Students who finish two-year programs often fail to transfer to four-year colleges because many of the credits earned at two-year schools are not transferable. Students interested in teaching especially have difficulty transferring because child care preparatory programs offered by two-year colleges are not designed for transfer into registered teacher education programs in four-year colleges.

This inability of minority students to transfer from two-year to four-year institutions, coupled with their significant dropout rate from four-year institutions, has contributed to the low proportion of minorities in teaching. In the state's five major cities, 1988-89 data show minority teachers constituting only 27.6% of teachers, while minority students constituted 77.8% of the public school population. These numbers are out of balance.

Collaboration in teacher education

To change this, the state education department used the SHEEO grant to encourage two- and four-year colleges to develop jointly registered teacher education programs allowing minority students to enter a teacher education program at a two-year institution, transfer to a four-year teacher education institution and be eligible for initial state teacher certification upon graduation.

The proposal was designed to address the two main problems that, even within the traditional articulation programs, continue to plague students transferring from two- to four-year colleges. First, as mentioned above, baccalaureate institutions hesitate to accept all credits earned by students in two-year institutions. Second, scholarships for students seeking teacher certification require they be enrolled in four-year teacher education programs; therefore, two-year institution students have difficulty securing financial support.

As the project got under way, the department convened a number of meetings with representatives from two- and four-year institutions to discuss the possibilities of jointly registered programs, explore collaborative steps that could be taken and share joint registration program designs. During the meetings, teacher educators and two-year college administrators and faculty expressed a need for financial assistance for planning and development. As a result, the department revised its original plan and cancelled a second set of meetings. Instead, it redirected money allocated for meetings and used it to help support joint programs.

At the same time, the department prepared draft policies about requirements for proposals for jointly registered programs. The policies stressed that:

- Students be simultaneously admitted to both institutions and enter the four-year program after satisfactory completion of their first two years of studies.
- A teacher education curriculum be negotiated and accepted by both institutions
- An associate degree be awarded by the two-year college and the baccalaureate by the four-year college
- The four-year college recommend students to the department for provisional certification as teachers

Furthermore, an articulation agreement for jointly registered programs was developed. It differs from traditional articulation agreements in three ways:

1. The program is registered by the State Education Department; therefore, the program and students in the program may receive federal and state financial aid.
2. Students enrolled in a jointly registered program at a two-year college are guaranteed access to an upper-level program at a four-year institution.
3. Beginning their freshman year, students in a jointly registered program are eligible for an Empire State Challenger Scholarship.

Ten pairs of colleges committed to jointly develop registered teacher education programs. Each pair consisted of a two-year college and a college or university with a four-year teacher preparation program. The department gave seed money to eight of the 10 pairs of institutions to develop programs. Two others were provided technical assistance to help them prepare their proposals for jointly registered programs.

To encourage the development of still more jointly registered programs, the department convened a statewide invitational conference. Representatives from colleges engaged in developing such programs shared their models with other interested members of the academic community and department.

Goals realized

The project has had several positive outcomes:

- The department has registered one joint teacher education program and is considering two others. Several more programs are forthcoming. However, none of these programs can appropriately be cited as the model to be followed. To be sure, certain things have to be done and certain others avoided in all jointly registered programs. But each program must have unique characteristics suited to the specific schools involved, individual faculties, available resources and students who are to be served.
- The Board of Regents has been kept fully informed of the project and has lent its full endorsement.

- Institutions throughout the state are enthusiastically committed to increasing their enrollment of minorities and assisting them to complete their baccalaureate degrees. The idea is so popular that two pairs of institutions independently developed joint programs, and a number of institutions in the public and independent sectors began to explore the development of their own jointly registered programs.
- Guidelines for the registration of jointly registered programs have been developed.
- The central administration of the State University of New York has provided special funding to help campuses hire minority faculty and develop jointly registered programs.

Next steps

A source of matching funds for the SHEEO grant was the state-funded Teacher Opportunity Corps (TOC). A further step toward increasing minority baccalaureate completion must be to modify this program to include the newly jointly registered programs as eligible applicants.

Another step is to evaluate the effectiveness of jointly registered programs in increasing the number of minority students in teacher education programs. An evaluation strategy to assess the impact of the project will include collecting the following data:

- To determine a baseline, the number of minorities who enroll, transfer and complete their education at each set of two-year and four-year institutions over five years
- In the first year, the number of first-year minority students enrolled in a jointly registered teacher education program and the number of those students who receive Challenger Scholarships
- In the third year, the number of minority students who are still enrolled in a jointly registered program, including those who have moved on to upper-level course
- In the fifth year, the number of minority students in the joint programs who complete their baccalaureate degrees and those who apply for teacher certification, as well as the number of minority students who still are enrolled in the jointly registered programs and are making progress in the program
- After it has been gathered, all of the data will be compared to the baseline data.

The number of minority teachers is expected to increase due in part to jointly registered programs. As a result, all children will have the opportunity to be taught by persons who reflect the diversity of New York's citizenry.

Mike Van Ryn, Denis Paul
and Ann Marie Haase
The State Education Department
The University of the State of New York

Making the Commitment To Change: New York's Jointly Registered Teacher Education Program

To date, 11 institutional partnerships either submitted or are developing proposals to the State Education Department for joint program registration. Even though only one has been registered by the department, each presents a model of cross-sector collaboration that can lead to increased minority student transfer and graduation.

- Kingsborough Community College and Brooklyn College propose a joint program that will prepare students for a degree in early childhood and elementary education. The new program offers an interdisciplinary approach that will strengthen the liberal arts program during the students' first years of study at the community college.

- LaGuardia Community College and Queens College soon will prepare students to enter the profession as elementary or early childhood teachers. Both institutions have identified and negotiated basic skills and liberal arts courses that meet requirements at both colleges and are transferable between colleges. They have modified program requirements to enable students to complete dual majors in liberal arts and education within the credit guidelines for the baccalaureate degree. Finally, they have developed an early advisement program that gives community college students accurate information about the courses needed to fulfill degree requirements.

- Students enrolling in the joint program to be offered by Bronx Community College and Lehman College will register for an articulated academic sequence of courses that begins at the community college and culminates with graduation from Lehman College and state certification as elementary or secondary school teachers. Special emphasis is being placed on collaborative support services, including joint recruitment and counseling.

- New York City Technical College (NYCTC) and City College of New York propose a program that allows students to enter the profession teaching technical education. The program is being designed so that students can take laboratory-based technology courses at the technical college, go on to complete requirements for the baccalaureate degree at City College and return to do student teaching at NYCTC or one of its feeder high schools.

- Pace University and Borough of Manhattan Community College propose two jointly registered B.A. programs in Spanish and social science leading to teaching credentials for middle/secondary school. In the pilot years, the programs will limit enrollment to closely monitor student progress and appropriately meet their needs. Students entering at the community college will be identified as joint associate and baccalaureate students and will have access to specially designed support services (i.e., academic advisement, financial aid and admissions counseling).

- Working from a long and respected relationship, Long Island University and Nassau Community College (NCC) have proposed a dual admission/guaranteed transfer program that will lead to elementary certification. The institutions have committed resources, administrative involvement and faculty support to guarantee to students that coursework completed at NCC will be accepted for credit toward the bachelor's degree.

- Long Island University and Suffolk Community College propose a jointly registered program leading to a bachelor's degree in education and certification to teach in elementary schools. The program is expected to succeed because of the strong relationship that exists between the institutions and their agreement that emphasis be on the

liberal arts in the students' first years of study.

- State University College at Brockport and Monroe Community College (MCC) are proposing a joint program leading to teacher certification in middle school. The institutions are negotiating admissions requirements and the teaching of an observation course at MCC.
- State University College at Oneonta and Hudson Valley Community College have proposed a joint registration agreement for the teacher education program in elementary education. The program allows the institutions to more effectively recruit students from under-represented groups into teacher education programs. Additionally, it assures their retention through prescribed courses, support services and financial aid.
- State University College at Fredonia and Hostos Community College propose a jointly registered program in elementary education. This effort bridges a rural baccalaureate-granting institution with an urban community college enrolling a significant number of Hispanic students. Innovative support features include housing, child care provision and financial aid that will help students with education expenses as well as assist them with travel and relocation costs.
- State University College at Buffalo and Erie Community College proposed two joint teacher preparation programs: one in secondary education/social studies and the other in elementary education. The state department registered the secondary education social studies program and expects to register the elementary education program in the near future. The community college conducts special recruitment activities directed at minority students who are entering as first-time college enrollees. Orientation, advisement and other support services are conducted by faculty and staff from both institutions. Additionally, community college coursework will appear on transcripts from the senior college.

State Profiles: Ohio

TURNING COMMUNITIES INTO EDUCATION LABORATORIES: THE OHIO PROJECT

In 1988, the Ohio Board of Regents conducted a comprehensive assessment of student access to and success in the state's higher education system. The study also evaluated how well the state's higher education community was responding to projected economic and human resource development needs. It revealed that Ohio, like many other states with a substantial number of minorities who currently are under-represented in higher education, was facing serious and urgent problems related to low student participation, greater costs being borne by students and high college dropout rates. It also revealed:

- Ohio's higher education participation rate is significantly lower than the national average. In 1987, 16.38% of adult Ohioans had completed four years of college compared to 20.06% of adult Americans, a 3.68 percentage point gap that translates into 252,000 people.
- Enrollments of African American students continue to decline at each level of higher education, even though the number graduating from high school is increasing.
- The state and its colleges and universities have not systematically addressed the barriers to participation, retention and student achievement faced by students from under-represented groups. (Students of African American and Appalachian origin constitute Ohio's largest under-represented groups in higher education.)
- Institutional attempts at improving access and retention have led to duplication of programs and gaps in services.

The challenge to increase student participation and decrease dropout rates is complex. Solutions require strategies that connect the whole education process and also impact the community.

The board developed the Postsecondary Education Demonstration Program (PEDP) to bring education institutions and community resources together to form local "laboratories for change." The program provides the collaborative framework for developing various strategies to increase the participation and retention rates of students from low-income and under-represented populations. Existing and new resources will be used to support these strategies, and a common monitoring and evaluation process will be used to measure student progress over time.

Urban collaboration

The SHEEO grant, combined with money from the Ohio Access Improvement Fund, was used to develop an implementation plan for one part of the board's comprehensive change strategy — the Urban Postsecondary Education Demonstration Program. These resources allowed the board to develop the local mechanism needed to implement urban "laboratories of change." The urban laboratories were designed to bring colleges and universities, schools, community agencies, foundations and other groups together to close the gaps in the education pipeline and draw significantly more minority students successfully through the education pipeline — from pre-kindergarten through graduate school. To achieve these goals, existing programs and resources needed to be shared among the partners, and new programs needed to be developed where gaps in service existed.

Seven sites were selected in which to set up urban laboratories. Selected sites had the highest proportions of potential students from low-income, first-generation college-going families and individuals from populations under-represented in higher education.

The Postsecondary Education Demonstration Program: A Policy for Change

To increase the education participation and retention rates of Ohio youth and adults from low-income and under-represented populations, the Postsecondary Education Demonstration Program will:

1. Introduce students early to an "education ethic," information on college choices and financial aid opportunities
2. Reach out to adults who traditionally lack higher education opportunities
3. Conduct comprehensive recruitment efforts in urban and rural communities
4. Provide special academic assistance to high school students in science, mathematics and writing and communication
5. Improve communication between faculty and counselors in secondary schools and higher education
6. Encourage vocational and community colleges to strengthen students so that they can succeed in higher education
7. Provide special programs for adult learners, such as GED, workplace literacy and college survival skills
8. Require students to take a basic skills assessment test and, if appropriate, be placed in remediation programs
9. Provide tutoring, learning laboratories and other academic support services
10. Encourage institutions to review financial aid practices and policies to ensure they support statewide access and retention goals for at-risk and part-time students
11. Encourage institutions to seek additional sources of student financial aid and improve the packaging of aid programs for at-risk students
12. Help students who enter a two-year college to immediately identify a baccalaureate institution and prepare a required course "road map" for transfer
13. Work with colleges and universities to assure articulation of coursework
14. Arrange for dual enrollment
15. Provide non-academic support services, such as child care and transportation
16. Conduct research on problems in urban and rural education, such as illiteracy and underpreparation of students
17. Develop a mechanism for conducting a longitudinal study of each entering class for at least six years to measure educational and career goal achievement
18. Modify data bases to track students upon entry into state colleges and universities
19. Develop an evaluation method that will determine the effectiveness of intervention strategies
20. Disseminate results throughout the education community

Each local laboratory pilot project involved high levels of collaboration. Several statewide activities took place to facilitate the work of the local laboratories and help remove barriers to change:

- A full-time director of access and retention programs was employed by the board to give continuing leadership to the PEDP and provide assistance in local laboratory development.

- A statewide Articulation and Transfer Policy was drafted. (Ohio did not have an operative policy before the PEDP.)
- A guidebook for college and university faculty on "The Faculty Role in Minority Student Achievement" was developed.
- Two-year colleges and vocational and comprehensive high schools worked together to develop technical-preparatory program plans.

A concept paper became the initial basis for the PEDP planning process. It described successful participation and retention strategies, specified the project objectives and expected outcomes.

Several meetings were held to develop collaboration in each community. They helped increase awareness of the issues and facilitate development of a community-based plan.

The board learned several important lessons from these meetings:

1. College and university policy leaders knew that progress was not being made in Ohio with regard to minority student achievement in higher education. But they had a tendency to blame others (e.g., elementary and secondary education) for the problems and were at a loss to find solutions.

   Community leaders had differing levels of awareness depending upon their own personal experiences (e.g., being a member of a racial minority culture or involvement with access/retention projects). Business and church leaders appeared to be anxious to help resolve the problems if they were provided with a step-by-step process and specific things to do.

2. Each of the seven communities was at a different level of collaborative development with regard to education issues and problems. Some of them required limited board involvement, while others lacked local leadership and required more direct board involvement.

3. The involvement of senior board staff was necessary to sustain a high-level commitment from college/university participants. The involvement of junior board staff was usually met with a like level of institutional commitment — involvement of persons who had little influence on institutional policy.

4. The program approach needed to vary from community to community. The initial approach of bringing community leaders together to develop the collaborative mechanism for project planning was not the best approach to use in all seven communities.

5. Much more board staff time was needed to carry out the program's objectives.

New directions

Drawing from the lessons learned, the planning process was refocused. The chancellor of the board designated a "leadership campus" in each of the urban demonstration sites and requested that the campus president appoint a policy-level representative to a newly constituted Statewide Program Planning council.

The Statewide Program Planning council focused on concept-paper objectives as a basis for initiating laboratory activities. Activities included:

- Assessment of baseline data regarding needs and barriers to higher education access and retention
- Determination of which types of interventions are most needed and feasible in the seven urban areas, based on an inventory of local access and success programs and services
- Collaboration with neighboring institutions in planning and implementation
- Consolidation of programs already in existence
- Development of new intervention strategies
- Leveraging a variety of resources

The statewide planning process itself yielded several important results. The planning council discussed strategies that would be suc-

cessful in increasing the participation and retention of targeted groups, focused attention on existing local- and state-level resources, laid the philosophical and practical groundwork for development of an evaluation plan, recommended development of a statewide student tracking system and began to build a structure for collaboration.

Each leadership campus developed and sharpened campus inventories of relevant activities and resources, identified one or two objectives from the concept paper to guide activities and initiated dialogue both within the campus and with external groups about the program.

Problems to overcome

The planning process also helped the board identify a number of problems that needed attention. One problem is that institutions have limited capacity to achieve PEDP goals. There are many programs in place within colleges and universities, schools and community groups that address access and retention issues, but very few of them are connected to one another (or even known by others within the institution or the larger community). Also, very few programs are tied directly to college or university policies or plans; rather, most are developed by an individual on campus, in relative isolation of other activities under way on campus.

Additionally, most programs do not have evaluation strategies or an ability to track students to see if the intervention has been successful or to find out what happened to the student after he/she left the program.

Finally, most programs are directed toward recruitment or access activities; very few programs are directed toward retention.

Another problem is that institutions are not fully utilizing their capacity for collaboration. Because the institutional focus has been so strongly oriented to recruitment activities rather than retention, neighboring institutions perceive one another as competitors, not collaborators. Local politics and the mix of personalities add to the difficulty of collaboration. Even in those cases where collaborative relationships have been in place for many years around a variety of issues, the nature of the relationship tended to change when confronted with PEDP goals. It became clear that each site would need staff leadership to coordinate PEDP activities as well as to stabilize the interpersonal relationships.

To keep up with PEDP activities, the board's project director assumed multiple roles. As choreographer, the project director gave considerable attention to project design and how to implement the design. As coach, the director helped participants identify and learn how to use a variety of resources and provided encouragement to help them achieve what is possible. As a broker, the director disseminated information about funding sources, program ideas and possible participants. Finally, as evaluator, the director assessed project and individual site efforts.

Evaluating the community labs

Both the increasing scarcity of fiscal resources and the gravity of Ohio's education dilemmas require information that can be used to effectively and efficiently facilitate change. Evaluation efforts are generally concerned about assessing the results of programs and/or making judgments about the desirability or value of programs. Given these concerns, evaluation issues were raised early in the planning process. By integrating the planning process and evaluation design, "real world" structure was given to the conceptual framework and enabled participants to more effectively discuss their ideas, collaboration strategies and data needs.

The evaluation design took into consideration the individual needs of each demonstration laboratory's host community and that important, influential events cannot be controlled or manipulated. Further, it recognized that local programs function in political contexts that are local, state and national all at the same time. Also, because there are multiple strategies for achieving local laboratory goals, multiple evaluation strategies were necessary. (This should not create concern insofar as the total design is well-integrated, and the methods employed yield evidence that is objective, systematic and comprehensive.)

The evaluation design included four interrelated phases: (1) design and development of local laboratories; (2) program accountability and

monitoring; (3) assessment of mid- and long-range results and impact; and (4) synthesis of laboratory experiences in preparation for replication and expansion.

Looking back, project staff recognize ways in which the planning process might have worked better. First, to accomplish the program's objectives in one year's time, the number of sites should be reduced. This would allow for a more thorough search for existing activities, prospective participants and leadership potential in participating communities. Local politics, historical turf battles, personality conflicts and value differences must be neutralized before successful collaborative planning and action can take place. (To create the needed impact in Ohio, however, it was necessary to establish demonstration sites in all of the state's seven major metropolitan areas because the problems are so great and the strategies for change so urgent.)

Second, unless faced with time constraints, collaboration issues must be worked out before an implementation plan is developed. In some communities it is more difficult to build a collaborative structure if it is perceived that a certain campus has been ordained a leadership role. Also, the Board of Regents should have played a more visible role in the development of local laboratory sites.

Third, a full-time project director, plus additional project staff, should have been hired at the very beginning. One part-time person cannot devote the necessary time to nurture the development of laboratories in seven sites.

Finally, it is important to build on existing collaborative structures in each of the local communities where possible.

Future plans

Major activities that likely will be channeled through the demonstration sites are: (1) a state/foundation-funded program to successfully recruit, prepare and retain teachers of African American, Native American, Hispanic and Appalachian origin; (2) the implementation of bilateral institutional agreements at the community level to insure transfer and articulation from two-year colleges to universities; and (3) a major new state initiative in mathematics, science and engineering education.

Ohio's approach to expanding the number of baccalaureate graduates from groups historically under-represented in higher education is multi-faceted, long-term and oriented to fundamental change. It is hoped that final results of the program will have far-reaching implications for communities and states wishing to significantly improve the academic achievement levels of all students.

Ann H. Moore, Judith James
and Valora Washington
Ohio Board of Regents

State Profiles: Tennessee

FINANCIAL INCENTIVES: TENNESSEE'S OPPORTUNITY FOR PROGRESS

Tennessee, outside the context of desegregation funding, has been considered an innovator in financing public higher education through the Performance Funding Program. This highly successful program allocates funds to institutions based on quality outcomes and has yielded documented improvements in undergraduate teaching and learning.

Most states fund higher education through a combination of formula allocations based on cost studies and legislative initiatives undertaken by individual campuses. However, among the shortcomings of formula funding is a lack of distinction between adequate and inadequate institutional performance. Performance funding does not seek to supplant formula funding, but rather to provide additional funds as an incentive to focus attention on performance outcomes. Furthermore, the evaluation required by performance funding can be a strong diagnostic tool for individual campuses and also responds to legislative and public demands for accountability for all the public sector.

Performance funding uses outcomes measures that provide an opportunity for universities, community colleges and technical institutes to earn funds above the formula. Institutions' performance is scored based on the following:

- Percentage of accreditable programs that are accredited
- Percentage of students scoring above the mean on licensing/certification exams
- Standardized test scores of graduates
- Placement of graduates at two-year institutions
- External review of master's programs
- American College Test (ACT) composite scores
- Degree of alumni satisfaction
- Report of corrective measures taken to address deficiencies in other standards
- Developing and piloting of assessment instruments

Not all recent improvements in Tennessee higher education can automatically be attributed to performance funding. However, certain improvements have been spurred by this program, including:

- A markedly higher percentage of accreditable programs have been accredited since the implementation of performance funding.
- More students are passing professional examinations at rates exceeding the norm.
- There has been a steady rise in ACT composite scores.

Beyond these quantitative indicators, some striking reforms have occurred. A number of campuses are using assessment results to develop more effective instructional programs. (For example, one institution has a sophisticated study under way to investigate links between student course work and performance on the ACT-Composite. The results of the study will be used to help develop a core curriculum.)

Based on the success of performance funding, the state used the SHEEO grant to develop a similar program. It uses financial incentives to achieve racial equity in higher education and improve the retention and graduation success of African American students, the state's most significant under-represented group.

As of spring 1988, the baccalaureate graduation rate for whites was 44% at universities and 18% at two year institutions. For blacks, it was 24% at universities and 7% at two-year

institutions. Given the size of this gap, blacks are not being served as well as whites in Tennessee public higher education.

Public awareness of each institution's performance funding score motivated institutions to improve the quality of education provided to all students. Likewise, public knowledge of performance funding scores based on minority achievement improvements should motivate institutions to provide greater racial equity in the retention and graduation of minorities in higher education.

Hard work for results

Tennessee's project consisted of three phases: (I) investigation and analysis, (II) improvement programs and (III) minority student academic achievement funding. Each phase involved distinct activities that served as building blocks for the next phase. In addition, each phase involved individuals from various arenas.

During Phase I, project staff, in conjunction with ACT, analyzed data from Tennessee's public higher education system to determine the strongest predictors of deterrents to minority student academic achievement. This involved merging the ACT profile with Tennessee data regarding race, age, sex and full-time/part-time status of non-returning students. Results shared with the state's institutions included:

- Of the black freshmen who re-enrolled in 1987, 71% re-enrolled as freshmen, compared to 56% for white freshmen.
- Retention rates for black males were slightly lower than those for black females at almost all schools.
- There was a clear trend indicating that the more hours black students planned to work and the lower their gradepoint average, the more likely they were to drop out.
- Black students with low ACT composite scores had a considerably higher dropout rate, compared to those with high ACT composite scores. When an increase in the number of work hours planned was combined with a decrease in ACT scores, a higher dropout rate resulted.
- Black students with relatively high writing accomplishment scores were at a much lower risk of dropping out and their dropout rates were unaffected by planned number of work hours. However, for students with lower writing accomplishment scores, there was a negative effect due to planned work hours.
- First-year dropout rates for blacks at the University of Tennessee, specifically, showed the strongest effect from the combination of planned work hours with family income. (For example, students with low family incomes who planned to work more than 20 hours a week were at the highest risk of dropping out.)
- Generally, students who planned to work more than 20 hours a week and those with low gradepoint averages also were more likely to drop out. This information suggests possible intervention strategies in the areas of financial assistance and tutorial or remedial services.
- Several accomplishment scores were significant negative predictors for the black sample. Surprisingly, this indicates that the greater a student's accomplishments in a given area, the less likely she or he is to remain enrolled in college. (A student who scores high with regard to athletic accomplishment, for example, may have little interest in, or time for, academics and therefore is more likely to dropout.)
- Another unexpected relationship was that for some groups, it appears that the more certain a student is about his or her career path, the less likely he or she is to stay in school. It might be hypothesized that the reason this outcome would occur is if the student is unable to pursue his or her chosen career in the school in which he or she has enrolled, then the student is likely to drop out.

Increasing awareness of issue

Phase II increased awareness of the need to improve minority student achievement among institutions and the general public through a statewide invitational conference, three regional workshops and institutional review of programs and policies.

The statewide conference involved education, legislative, business and community leaders. The three regional workshops provided information on program strategies for enhancing minority student performance. In addition, the sessions afforded opportunities for institutions to exchange information about programs being developed or implemented and the anticipated effects of those programs.

The program and policy review was an opportunity for each institution to examine its current programs designed to foster equity, identify problems and begin to find solutions.

Phase II also included an advisory committee composed of members of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission, both higher education governing boards, community leaders, the State Department of Education and the legislature. The role of the committee was to review project activities and to recommend a proposed incentive funding policy to the Phase III Advisory Panel. (The Phase III panel was essentially a sub-set of the Phase II Advisory Committee with campus representatives added.)

Phase II and III committees were expansive to promote ownership by many powerful segments of the Tennessee community. The power and influence of these involved individuals will be essential when the commission explores securing money beyond that currently available for desegregation funding.

During Phase III, the Advisory Panel and Phase II committee used both the ACT report and other statewide student data to understand state trends regarding enrollment, progress and program completion. The analysis indicated that between 1987 and 1989, black first-time freshmen enrollment increased 14.89% compared to 3.23% for whites. Although black enrollment rates are higher than whites, progress and completion rates are reversed. For example, 36% of blacks who initially enrolled in fall 1988 also enrolled in fall 1989, compared to 42% of whites. Additionally, the six-year (1983-1989) completion rate for first-time, full-time black students at universities was 24%, compared to 44% for whites.

This analysis was essential to the Phase III panel's policy development effort. The proposed policy had five standards. The first standard was intended to reward institutions for increasing black student participation in higher education. The intent of the second standard was to reward institutions for increasing student progress toward program completion. The third standard's intended outcome was to increase the number of black students who complete undergraduate degrees or certificates. The primary intent of the fourth standard was to encourage two-year institutions to prepare black students for transfer to four-year institutions and encourage four-year institutions to recruit and accept black two-year program completers to continue work toward a baccalaureate degree. To recognize the variation among institutions with reference to mission and unique circumstances, the fifth standard permitted institutions to develop two other indicators of minority achievement.

Institutional review provided an opportunity for the institutions to have input into development of the five standards. Points will be scored for institutional achievement or progress toward standard achievement. Points also will be scored if none of the strategies mentioned in the plans were used, but the racial gaps were closed. Money will be awarded based on points scored.

Achieving goals

The main goal of this project was to develop and implement a statewide funding policy to enhance minority student academic performance at the undergraduate level. Although the policy framework continues to evolve, the main components of the policy are in place. As intended, the policy places considerable emphasis on student outcomes (i.e., degree completion), but recognizes the importance of process indicators such as enrollment, progression, transfers and other institutionally identified indicators.

Given the success of the state's Performance Funding Program, it is anticipated that this

Increasing Minority Student Undergraduate Academic Achievement
Tennessee's Proposed Model Funding Policy

I. Student Enrollment

Purpose: The first step toward increasing the number of black graduates is to increase black enrollments. The college enrollment rate reflects a disparity between blacks and whites which is ultimately reflected in graduation rates. This standard is intended to reward institutions for increasing black student participation in higher education.

Evaluation and Scoring: Evaluation will be based on the percent of black undergraduates enrolled in credit courses. The desegregation long-range enrollment objectives for each institution, as referred to in the Stipulation of Settlement, shall be used as the standard for assessment.

II. Student Progression

Purpose: Enrollment and retention are not enough; to graduate, students must also progress through prescribed curricula. The intent of this standard is to reward institutions increasing student progress toward program completion.

Evaluation and Scoring: Evaluation will be based on (1) the percent of black credit enrolled students who advance to a higher academic level; and (2) the ratio of black to white progression rates.

III. Program Completion

Purpose: The primary focus of this standard is on outcome rather than process. Since the intended outcome is to increase the number of black students who complete undergraduate degrees or certificates, the majority of points awarded by this standard will be directed toward that end.

Evaluation and Scoring: Evaluation will be based on (1) the percent of black students who complete programs as indicated in the Tennessee Higher Education Commission's Report of Graduates; and (2) the ratio of black to white completion rates.

IV. Student Transfer

Purpose: It is acknowledged that the role of transfers between institutions is a helpful process toward the ultimate goal of increasing blacks who complete academic programs. The primary intent of this standard is (1) to encourage two-year institutions to prepare black students for transfer to four-year institutions; and (2) to encourage four-year institutions to recruit and accept black two-year program completers to continue work toward a baccalaureate degree.

Evaluation and Scoring: Evaluation will be based on the percent change of black students who transfer to a four-year institution. Institutions enrolling transfer students will earn points, as will the originating institution.

V. Institutionally Identified Indicators

Purpose: To recognize the variation among institutions with reference to mission and unique circumstances, this standard permits institutions to choose two other indicators of minority achievement.

Evaluation and Scoring: (a) All institutions, except Tennessee State University (TSU), Shelby State Community College (SSCC) and technical institutes, can earn up to 20 points under this standard, and can elect two indicators for assessment worth 10 points each. (b) TSU, SSCC (historically black institutions) and all technical institutes (non-transfer institutions) will be eligible to earn up to 30 points under this standard, and can elect three indicators for assessment worth 10 points each.

proposed incentive policy also will result in an increase in minority student academic performance. While positive results are expected, it also is expected that these results will take several years to fully emerge following implementation.

Given the state's history with both incentive funding and desegregation, this strategy to enhance minority student performance was a logical progression. Institutions' reactions to the funding policy concept generally have been positive. One policy concern has been whether or not additional state dollars would be appropriated to implement the policy or whether the existing pool of desegregation funds would be reallocated. This concern has been expressed by institutions that are behind in achieving desegregation and racial equity.

It is too early to determine community and political reactions to the policy. However, community support is expected since this policy is intended to enhance equity and achievement of a growing sector of the population. Given the involvement of key legislators, strong political support for the policy concept and its funding also is expected.

Intended and unintended outcomes

The short-term intended outcomes were to create and implement an incentive funding policy for minority student academic achievement, receive funding for the policy and secure formal written reviews of each institution's efforts to improve minority performance. The policy has been developed, and institutions have submitted written reports of their activities. However, the policy has not been funded or implemented.

Whether or not new dollars are made available or current dollars are used, the project has enhanced the state's efforts to address the disparity in academic performance between minority and majority students. It has increased general awareness of the challenge to improve minority student academic performance; identified possible solutions and resource people in the field of minority student success; and increased the support of institutional staff, governing boards and the legislature. The project also has lent clearer insight on the policies, programs and procedures at institutions that affect minority students; the priorities that institutions would set to address the challenge of fostering minority student academic success; and black students' performance on discrete indicators as compared to white students.

Through the institutional response reports and audits, it was discovered that institutions frequently use scholarships and involvement from the black community to recruit black students. Peer mentors, tutors and faculty mentors are popular means of fostering retention, progression and program completion among students. Special efforts, such as black cultural centers, Black History Month activities and counseling programs, also were identified as means to promote minority student academic achievement. Unfortunately, many programs are too new to show an effect. Anecdotal reports, however, would indicate that these programs are effective.

One unexpected constraint during the development of the policy was a 20-year-old legal case that addressed desegregation of public higher education in Tennessee and provided a legal framework for developing policies regarding minority students. The *Geier* case primarily addressed inequities in access to higher education, while this project was directed toward inequities in the quality of education. Guidance provided by legal staff enabled the incentive funding policy development process to continue without conflicting with the court case.

What's next?

Recommended future actions for the commission regarding the performance of minority student academic achievement are as follows:

- Adequate funding for policy implementation must be secured.
- An evaluation plan of the funding policy should be developed prior to program implementation. (The evaluation would indicate whether the funding policy is a successful means of enhancing minority student academic achievement over time. It

also could identify necessary policy modifications, as well as implementation obstacles.)

- The final policy must be disseminated to institutions, giving them enough time to seek any clarifications and implement institutional strategies. Further, the commission should make the experiences of the Tennessee project available to other states that are considering incentive funding as a means of enhancing minority student academic achievement.
- The development of innovative initiatives to enhance minority participation and success at the graduate level must receive similar attention.

Ingredients for success

This project was fortunate to operate in an environment that supports improvements in minority student academic achievement. Existing support, combined with a policy concept that was familiar to institutions, set the stage for successful policy development. Institutional and governing board staff were very involved with the project on several levels and carefully offered comments to design a funding program that would have the best chance for success. In addition, lessons learned from the Performance Funding Program provided insight into implementation problems that could be addressed during the development process.

Rewarding performance, rather than prescribing programs, is an appropriate approach for Tennessee because institutional personnel are committed to minority student success and are reasonably equipped to foster that success.

Lucius Ellsworth, Wynetta Lee
and Mattielyn Williams
Tennessee Higher Education Commission

Conclusion

BUILDING COALITIONS: LESSONS LEARNED

In 1987, when SHEEO issued its report, *A Difference of Degrees*, much needed to be done to make minority achievement the preeminent concern of states. With a few notable exceptions, state higher education boards were not then providing the leadership needed to initiate and sustain support for efforts targeted at minorities. In an informal survey of higher education officials, the question of minority achievement was nowhere near the top of state agendas at that time. In contrast, when they were asked in 1990 to rank the most important issues facing their state, minority achievement, along with the quality of undergraduate education, was their number one concern.

This change has occurred for a number of reasons. Growing awareness of demographic trends alone has awakened many state officials to the necessity of improving minority achievement, for economic as well as social justice reasons. State leadership also has been an important factor as governors, legislators and other state officials have spoken forcefully and with conviction about the importance of better serving minority students.

Because of these changes, many states have been willing to think about how to gain the goal of full participation in new and creative ways. Building coalitions among institutions and across sectors is the theme that unites many of the cases in this study. The eight initiatives described earlier are by no means the extent of new thinking on the subject of minority achievement. Exciting new models also were reported on by the National Center for Postsecondary Education and Finance in its project headed by Richard C. Richardson and the Education Commission of the States. A national task force on minority achievement was chaired by Governor Carruthers of New Mexico. These collective efforts document some of the best and most exciting new state developments in this area.

What lessons can we learn from these new models? Where have we made progress? And what still needs to be done?

Collaboration works and is essential to success

Collaboration is the mechanism by which the concept of "all one system" becomes reality. If higher education is to be successful in enrolling, retaining and graduating larger numbers of minorities, it will require more and better collaboration with schools and with communities. The task is simply too large and the stakes too great for colleges and universities to operate unilaterally.

Despite this reality, far too little collaboration actually takes place. That is why the experience of some of the states described in this study is so important. The cases described earlier in Ohio, Arizona, and Montana suggest new models and new structures from which others can learn.[18]

Collaboration will require a new role for many state boards of higher education. The word itself — collaboration — implies a strategy of equality with the organizations with whom one works, especially when those organizations and groups are outside the formal structure of higher education. Barbara Gray, in her book *Collaborating*, suggests that "collaborative problems" are often ill-defined and that "several stakeholders have a vested interest in the problem."[19] Resolution depends on a "shared vision" which in turn depends upon joint ownership.

State higher education boards, whether coordinating or governing, are well suited for playing the convening role for such collaborations. Their traditional roles of coordination are quite similar to this new coalition-building strategy. To achieve gains in minority achievement, however, calls for involvement with a wider set of "stakeholders." It also requires new skills

from both board members and staffs, including an enhanced ability to communicate, negotiate and mediate a "shared agenda" for minority success. Mistrust between schools and colleges abounds, as does mistrust between community people and professionals in the field of education. However, the examples presented here demonstrate that these barriers can be overcome.

Information is a catalyst for change

What appears to be self-evident, is often neglected. The skillful management of a process of collecting information and studying the scope of a problem can be a powerful catalyst for change. As important as improving the success of minorities in higher education may be, it must effectively compete with other pressing problems both within an institution and in the broader realm of public policy. If minority achievement is to be a priority of the campus, of the system, of the state, a forceful case must be made.

Ironically, institutions and interest groups often oppose a full exposure of the underlying problems, limited successes and challenges. Yet it is this exposure, no matter how negative at first blush, that is the first step to political action. In Montana, knowing the extent of under-representation of the American Indian population in the state education system was a necessary first step for broader action. In other states, such as New Jersey and Florida, exposure of the scope of the academic deficiencies of minority freshman was a necessary first step to greater financial commitment to programs that would remedy the deficiencies.

This is why Montana's and Colorado's projects were aimed directly at the development of better and more comprehensive data on how students move through the education system, what barriers they face and how their needs can more effectively be met. Sophisticated data-gathering and reporting mechanisms are not enough, however. If information is to be a catalyst for change, it must be communicated better to the right people. Publications and data presentations need more clarity and less jargon. Audiences must be broadened to include students and parents and the general public. Media relations must improve. Data must communicate a message by telling a compelling story, rather than being buried in an appendix to a lengthy accountability report.

Standards for measuring success must change

Even five years ago, if one had asked the question, "How are you doing with minorities?" campus presidents most likely would have quoted the latest enrollment figures. Today, such responses are no longer adequate. While not all students must graduate to benefit from a higher education program, high dropout rates are strong warning signals of lack of success. Similarly, if students are graduating but not passing the licensing exams for their fields or not gaining access to the job market, efforts also must be judged largely unsuccessful.

Outcome measures — retention, graduation and successful entry into the job market — must be the yardsticks by which institutions are held accountable. Several of the states in this study — most notably Illinois, Colorado and Tennessee — made real progress in shifting the evaluation of their programs to these outcome measures. After "successful" programs are defined as those that actually achieve results, one can look at how those programs accomplish their goals and build those characteristics into less successful efforts.

When the standards of success are changed from input to output, state boards must be willing to take the next, and more difficult step — targeting dollars at the most effective programs and eliminating those that are not working. Unfortunately, "special programs" for minorities are not unlike other initiatives in higher education. Once established, they gain a life of their own and a constituency that has a vested self-interest in their continuation regardless of their actual effectiveness.

Assessment should be a tool for inclusion, not exclusion

Testing, as one form of assessment, can be a major stumbling block to the progress of minorities in higher education. Paradoxically, it

also can be the gateway to success. The key is to use testing and other forms of assessment as tools for inclusion, not exclusion. The experience of New Jersey, Tennessee and other states provides excellent models. State- and/or system-wide basic skills testing is part of an overall strategy to improve graduation rates. Academic deficiencies of entering students are identified, remedial support is provided and institutions are held accountable for their success with these students. Assessment of general education programs provides valuable feedback to faculty and administrators for changing curriculum.

Such assessment programs can insure that the degrees earned have value and credibility in the marketplace. At the same time, the quality and breadth of assessments need continually to be improved to make sure students and faculty are provided feedback on a wider range of skills that contribute to collegiate success.

Statewide assessments also can be powerful tools for improved funding of initiatives targeted at minorities. This has been the case in every state undertaking basic skills testing of freshman. In the absence of these initiatives, it is difficult to gain attention of state legislators and governors for such unpopular ideas as college-level remediation. More likely, these political constituencies will suggest that such tasks are not the job of colleges, but the schools.

Barriers to transfer must be removed

If states are going to succeed in graduating more minorities with bachelors degrees, the transfer function of community colleges must be significantly strengthened. Many community colleges are apparently neglecting their transfer function, and four-year institutions continue to place stumbling blocks in the way of transfer students. This is especially true in competitive programs such as engineering, business and health-related fields, where senior institutions show preference for their "native" students over transfers. Such problems are daunting for minorities who seek to move from the culture of an urban community college to a major state university in a suburban or rural location.

State boards are not comfortable with the transfer issue. Few want to undertake statewide mandates; rather, they seek to encourage case-by-case solutions as evidenced by the Massachusetts and New York experiences. Both of these cases, however, provide new approaches to an old problem. The development of truly integrated programs with guarantees assuring transfer is a step in the right direction.

Broader public policy questions also must be faced. In many states, community colleges and four-year institutions compete directly for the same students, with the community colleges unable to attract a core of students whose career aspirations extend beyond the terminal degree programs. Furthermore, if the funding base in two-year institutions is not adequate to support a quality undergraduate experience, transfer and articulation efforts may be doomed to failure. States also may need tougher accountability standards to encourage both two- and four-year institutions. Financial incentives — both positive and punitive — should be tied to demonstrable success in transferring and accepting minorities, especially in high-demand programs with critical under-representation.

Minorities and undergraduate reform

States have come to realize that improving minority success and improving the quality of undergraduate education are directly linked. Rather than being in competition, these two agendas are a two-sided coin of the same denomination. Improve one and the other is improved. Fail with one and the other fails. Furthermore, if minority initiatives are linked to broader reform efforts, they are more likely to be sustained by both the state and the institutions.

Not only do these two agendas have similar goals, the strategies for obtaining these goals overlap. Improved counseling and advising, "hospitable" climates and personal connections between faculty and students will improve the success of all students — both minority and majority.

A coordinating board executive was once asked why he spent so much time arguing for

better undergraduate education in his state. "No one needs to remind institutions of their research and public service responsibilities," he responded. "But providing a quality undergraduate experience can be easily neglected." And to neglect undergraduate education is to neglect minorities. It is as simple as that.

Accountability and the Social Contract

How should higher education respond to the needs of minorities? If it does so grudgingly and defensively, it is in danger of losing its position of moral and intellectual leadership. African Americans, Hispanics and other peoples of color around the world will view it as an institution living on sinecures, irrelevant and even hostile to their personal and collective goals.

In a democracy, such an institution is unlikely to prosper. Minorities themselves will seek other avenues of advancement. State leaders will find other priorities to fund. Thus, success with minority students is the cornerstone to institutional viability. An institution irrelevant to 40% or 50% of school-age children of the 21st century can hardly claim either financial or moral respect. Rather than a burden, public accountability for success with minorities is both a necessity and a moral imperative.

James R. Mingle
Executive Director

Appendix

STATE HIGHER EDUCATION BOARDS AWARDED CHALLENGE GRANTS

ARIZONA BOARD OF REGENTS
3030 North Central Avenue, Suite 1400
Phoenix, Arizona 85012
602-255-4082

COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
Colorado History Museum
1300 Broadway, 2nd Floor
Denver, Colorado 80203
303-866-2723

ILLINOIS BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
500 Reisch Building
4 West Old Capitol Square
Springfield, Illinois 62701
217-782-2551

MASSACHUSETTS BOARD OF REGENTS OF HIGHER EDUCATION
McCormack Building, Room 1401
One Ashburton Place
Boston, Massachusetts 02108-1530
617-727-7785

MONTANA UNIVERSITY SYSTEM
33 South Last Chance Gulch
Helena, Montana 59620
406-444-6570

NEW YORK BOARD OF REGENTS
THE NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Cultural Education Center
Albany, New York 12230
518-474-2175

OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS
30 East Broad Street, 36th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43266-0417
614-466-5866

TENNESSEE HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION
404 James Robertson Parkway
Parkway Towers, Suite 1900
Nashville, Tennessee 37219
615-741-6230

Notes

1. For example, if we compare the full-time college-going rate of 18-24-year-old dependent students from white, black and Hispanic families with incomes of $40,000 to $50,000, the rate is virtually the same: 44% for whites, 44% for blacks and 41% for Hispanics. See, *School Enrollment — Social and Economic Characteristics of Students: October 1988 and 1987*, U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, April 1990, Table 16, p. 64. Percentages were calculated taking the number of white, black and Hispanic families (income of $40,000 to $50,000) with one or more dependents attending college full time, divided by the number of white, black and Hispanic families with dependents 18-24 years old.

2. U. S. Department of Commerce, *Money Income and Poverty Status in the United States, 1989* (Washington, D. C.: Bureau of the Census, March 1990), pp. 7-9. Thomas G. Mortenson and Zhijun Wu, *High School Graduation and College Participation of Young Adults by Family Income Backgrounds 1970 to 1989* (Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing, September 1990), pp. xix, 43.

3. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, *Dropout Rates in the United States: 1989* (Washington, D. C.: National Center for Education Statistics, September 1990), Table 5, p. 11. Deborah J. Carter and Reginald Wilson, *Eighth Annual Status Report: Minorities in Higher Education* (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, December, 1989), p. 1.

4. U.S. Department of Education, *National Longitudinal Study of 1988 — A Profile of the American Eighth Grader: NELS:88 Student Descriptive Summary* (Washington, D. C.: National Center for Education Statistics, June 1990).

5. *U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Eighth Graders' Reports of Courses Taken During the 1988 Academic Year by Selected Student Characteristics* (Washington, D. C.: National Center for Education Statistics, July 1990), p. 1.

6. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, *Who Majors in Science? College Graduates in Science, Engineering, or Mathematics from the High School Class of 1980* (Washington, D. C.: National Center for Education Statistics, June 1990), pp. 5-11.

7. U.S. Department of Education, *Selected Data on Minority Participation in Schools* (Washington, D. C.: National Center for Education Statistics, June 1990), p. 13. Michael T. Nettles, ed., *The Effect of Assessment on Minority Student Participation* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990), p. 2.

8. U.S. Department of Commerce, *School Enrollment — Social and Economic Characteristics of Students: October 1988 and 1987* (Washington, D. C.: Bureau of the Census, April 1990), pp. 180-185. See, Table A-7, *Persons 14 to 24 Years Old by High School Graduate Status, College Enrollment, Attainment, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: October 1967 to 1988.*

9. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, *Trends in Racial/Ethnic Enrollment in Higher Education: Fall 1978 through Fall 1988* (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, June 1990), pp. 2,8.

10. U.S. Department of Commerce, *The Hispanic Population in the United States* (Washington, D. C.: Bureau of the Census, March 1989).

11. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement *Trends in Racial/Ethnic Enrollment in Higher Education: Fall 1978 through Fall 1988* (Washington, D.C: National Center for Education Statistics, June 1990), pp. 24-25.

12. Ibid, pp. 24-25.

13. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, *Education That Works: An Action Plan for the Education of Minorities* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, January 1990), p. 20.

14. Deborah J. Carter, *Eighth Annual Status Report*, pp. 10-11. The percentage of degrees conferred to Hispanics has increased from almost 18,000 in 1976 to nearly 27,000 in 1987 (a 50% increase). However, African Americans received fewer degrees: 59,000 in 1976 compared to over 56,000 in 1987 (a negative change of 4%). As a percentage of all bachelor degrees awarded, American Indians have not shown any gains: they continue to receive .4%.

15. State Higher Education Executive Officers, *A Difference of Degrees: State Initiatives to Improve Minority Student Achievement* (Denver, Colorado, July 1987).

16. Specifically, the board has approved an admissions goal of a compounded base rate increase in resident first-time attender and transfer minority students of 10% per year for the next five years. The board also approved a five-year goal of increasing resident minority student graduation from its universities by 50% by 1993.

17. Success was defined as continued enrollment in a two-year institution, transfer to a four-year institution, or receipt of a degree or certificate.

18. For another well-developed model of partnerships, see Manuel N. Gomez et. al., *To Advance Learning: A Handbook on Developing K-12 Postsecondary Partnerships* (Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1990).

19. Barbara Gray, *Collaborating* (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1989), p. 10.

State Higher Education Executive Officers
707 Seventeenth Street, Suite 2700
Denver, Colorado 80202-3427